

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA


LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA


THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

A

CRITICAL ENQUIRY

INTO THE

LETTERS OF JUNIUS.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

1912

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS





Engraved by Sir Joshua Reynolds

Sells & Strickley 20, 21, Strand.

J'ai l'honneur d'Être
votre très
humble serviteur
Geo: Sackville

A

CRITICAL ENQUIRY

regarding the real Author of the

LETTERS OF JUNIUS,

proving them

to have been written

353

Lord Viscount de la Roche.

BY

GEORGE COVENTRY.

Suspicion is a just ground of enquiry
Videantur sane, non afferentur modo. Junius
Si Avul quast

LONDON.

PRINTED BY G. WOODFALL

1825.

Printed by G. Woodfall, 15, Abchurch Lane.

UNIV. OF
CALIFORNIA

DA508

S3C7

HENRY MORSE STEPHENS

TO THE
ASSOCIATION

al

THE PUBLIC ARE RESPECTFULLY INFORMED,
THAT THIS IS THE WORK ANNOUNCED FOR PUB-
LICATION BY MR. MURRAY, IN NOVEMBER LAST.

DIRECTIONS TO THE BINDER.

Portrait to face Title-Page.

Fac-simile Letter after Title-Page.

Particular Words compared to follow Letter.

Caricature to face Page 35.

Table to face Page 256.

To

Captain Young
of Royal Engineers
Dragoon

Greenwich
Genl. Nichol
Remick on Green

Whitehall October 29th 1745

Dear George

I am extremely obliged to you for your letter thro' word
to me in English, must have been, to judge of it by its politeness,
translated from the French. You know enough of me to remember
that I am not given to compliments, so that I must content myself
in telling you, that I am greatly pleas'd in it, & that I am
a place in your thoughts and that I most heartily
congratulate you on your escape in that fatal day to this
Country; who has been so close time must show, the General

is suspected of want of conduct, those necessary to him in ^{command} not entirely cleared as yet in the minds of people, but all agree in the scandalous, and base behaviour of the British men, and all the same have do justice to the Courage and resolution of their officers after they were abandoned in a shameful a manner. The whole affair is to be enquired into and if any are guilty I trust they will be punished, but that will be but poor satisfaction. The letter you write from Edinburgh? never received, and that is amongst most probably not with the same fault. Becke is now Captain Lieutenant and after Enfield, he was shot thro' the foot at Fontenoy, and

Mo: he has saved his legs, he has not yett much use
of it. Jockyn is well and at Dunford encamp'd, I came
from Thence on Sunday four trillers & Le Com's Semain
Carr fully is just arriv'd from Caphing, his wounds are well
but his beauty rather decreased, the rest of your friends
go on as usual, but we have many new faces among us
since Gurner's gathering and your thanks. The other's
of every body is exulting upon the North and we wait
with great impatience to see the effect the arrival
of Marshal Breda ~~will~~ in that Country will have
upon the rebels, by their not having yett march'd
forthward it seems as if they had said the thoughts of
it aside, some go so far as to imagine that they

will achieve success. He testified upon his approval
without uttering a syllable, but I think as you have
is now equal to what ever they can hope here after
to share together that they will engage them all at
events, and if they should have success God knows what
the consequence would be. Grace would not then delay
a moment the making a decision in some part of England
New Local is crowded with people, and ^{of English} there are now
above forty dwell of male pupils, which may be
designed for an establishment. The House of
Commons will yesterday till seven o'clock, when Mr. Campbell
and Mr Pitt moved for enquiry immediately into the

Cause of the Progress of the Rebels, but the rebels were
thought a little premature as the bulk of their weapons
had not yet come at during the rebellion, so that
upon the division the rebels were rejected by 1946 112.
we have had the misfortune of losing a lady from this
rail all her time upon the coast of France towards Brest
it is supposed to be the first war of our, the war was
close to the French coast towards the coast of
the French, they all went to see the town, and the
and the town of the war of the coast, and the
and the coast of the war of the coast, and the

Hope you to hear some good news from you, and
that Mechanism as Druggers have achieved Re-Union.
By my saying nothing of myself you will conclude
that I have no Complaints.

Yours Dear Younger

Yours very sincerely

Francis Jackson



PARTICULAR LETTERS COMPARED.

JUNIUS. <i>(Woodville Specimens.)</i>	LORD SACKVILLE. <i>(Letters.)</i>	JUNIUS. <i>(Woodville Specimens.)</i>	LORD SACKVILLE. <i>(Letters.)</i>
<p>3^o 2. </p> <p>4. </p> <p>6. </p> <p>3. </p> <p>3. </p> <p>8. </p> <p>8. </p> <p>4. </p> <p>4. </p>	<p>3. </p> <p>3. </p> <p>4. </p> <p>1. </p> <p>2. </p> <p>3. </p> <p>5. </p> <p>3. </p> <p><i>Printed</i> 1. </p> <p>3. </p> <p>3. </p> <p>3. </p> <p>3. </p> <p>3. </p>	<p>3^o 3. </p> <p>6. </p> <p>3. </p> <p>6. </p> <p>3. </p> <p>6. </p> <p>6. </p> <p>6. </p> <p>10. </p> <p>40. </p> <p>40. </p> <p>40. </p>	<p>3^o 3. </p> <p>2. </p> <p>4. </p> <p>3. </p> <p>2. </p> <p>2. </p> <p>3. </p> <p>3. </p> <p>3. </p> <p>3. </p> <p>7. </p> <p>1. </p> <p>1. </p> <p><i>Printed</i></p>

PARTICULAR LETTERS COMPARED.

JUNIUS. <i>(Woodville Specimens.)</i>		LORD SACKVILLE. <i>(Letters.)</i>		JUNIUS. <i>(Woodville Specimens.)</i>		LORD SACKVILLE. <i>(Letters.)</i>	
17 ^o 10. 6	a a	a a	27 ^o 2. 3.	g	g g	37 ^o 4. 2.	
		a	1.	10.	H	5.	
10.	B	B B	4. 3.	27. 40.	I I	3. 3.	
41.	B	B B	5. 2.	6. 41.	I I	4. 5.	
27. 8.	C C	C C	3. 3.		K K	2. 1.	
40. 10.	C C	C C	3. 3.	41. 27.	L L	3. Frank	
3. 41.	C C	C C	5. 4.	2. 8.	L L	1. 2.	
10. 40.	D D	D D		2.	M	1. 3.	
40. 8.	D D	D D	3. 3.		m M	5. 4.	
		D D	3. 3.		N N	4. 4.	
10. 10. 41.	E E E	E E E	3. 3. 3.	10. 10.	n n	3. 1.	
6.	F	F F	3. 3.	10. 41.	n n	1. 1.	
6.	F	F F	3. 3.		n n	3. 3.	
40. 41. 41.	g g g	G G	Frank 3.	40.	O	3. 2.	
10.	g	G G	2. 5.	40. 40.	p p	3. 5.	
					P	1.	

PARTICULAR WORDS COMPARED.

JUNIUS.

(Woodhills Specimens)

LORD SACKVILLE.

(Letters)

17.
8.

had

had

17.
8.

6.

any

any

6.

8.

much

much

8.

40.

above

above

40.

20.

nothing

nothing

20.

41.

good

good

41.

40.

shall

shall

40.

6.

most

most

6.

41.

in

in

41.

40.

I

I

40.

20.

their

their

20.

6.

never

never

6.

8.

at

at

8.

20.

I (mis)

I (mis)

20.

6.

opposed

opposed

6.

6.

shall

shall

6.

PREFATORY REMARKS.

THE Letters of Junius are to be found in almost every gentleman's library in the kingdom. Their intrinsic ability, their fine flow of language, their disclosure of public events, the boldness with which they were written and ushered into the world; all combine to stamp upon them that eulogium which Junius himself, without vanity, has inserted in his Dedication to the English Nation:—

“When Kings and Ministers are forgotten, when the force and direction of personal satire is no longer understood, and when measures are only felt in their remotest consequences, this book will, I believe, be found to contain principles worthy to be transmitted to posterity.”

No other writings have afforded so fine a scope for literary discussion, or have been the theme of so much animadversion. The secrecy preserved by the Author has hitherto eluded all research, and greater mystery is attached to his writings than to the “ΕΙΚΩΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ” written in the

time of Charles the First. Like the sacred mysteries of Eleusis, the Great Unknown has been enveloped in darkness, which Junius declared to Mr. Wilkes was one source of the sublime. Remove the veil from the former, you discover that the mind has been credulously imposed upon ; but the veil removed from Junius will never lessen the intrinsic merit of his work. It is a solid fabric of human intellect which will for ever stand the test of criticism ; a fabric, the longer we gaze upon the greater is our admiration.

Numerous have been the claimants on behalf of different individuals for this literary trophy, none of whom down to the present hour have so borne the test of criticism as to merit the unfading laurel. The present Enquiry is submitted to the public, with full assurance that the Nobleman in question is entitled to that honour. Seldom, if ever, do the living reap the reward of their labours : when death has fixed his seal to their writings it remains with posterity to bestow the eulogium. Hence a costly monument is the common tribute that is paid to departed worth and genius.

This testimonial of a nation's gratitude is too often bestowed on names which would long ago have been forgotten, were we not occasionally reminded of them by a splendid ap-

peal to the understanding ; while the remains of Algernon Sydney and Lord Viscount Sackville lie to this hour in obscurity, with not a stone to mark the place of sanctuary. But the words, actions, and writings of such men as these will find a lasting monument in every cultivated mind, when the perishable tablet of marble is mingled with the dust. It would far exceed the limits of my pen, and would swell the present volume to an unnecessary size, were I to enter into the claims of those who have been brought forward as candidates for the authorship of the Letters in question ; they have all been ably refuted by men of far keener observation than myself.

I have carefully perused the whole of the voluminous controversy that has taken place at different periods on this interesting subject, wherein the claims of Thomas Hollis, William Henry Cavendish Bentick, John Roberts, J. P. de Lolme, John Horne Tooke, Charles Lloyd, Dr. Wilmot, Lord Shelburne, Samuel Dyer, Colonel Barrè, Bishop Butler, Edmund Burke, Dr. Gilbert Stuart, Hugh Macauley Boyd, Counsellor Dunning, William Greatreakes, Richard Glover, W. G. Hamilton, Rev. P. Rosenhagen, Sir William Jones, General Lee, John Wilkes, Edward Gibbon, and Sir Philip Francis have been brought forward and critically examined. On behalf of some of these individuals

strong presumptive evidence has been adduced, but which evidence has ultimately failed in many of the most material points. I shall therefore pass them over in silence, except the name of Sir Philip Francis, which I shall have occasion to notice further in the first Chapter.

There are also two other noble characters who have at times excited suspicion, but whose names are not inserted in the foregoing catalogue. I allude to the Earl of Chesterfield and Horace Walpole, Earl of Orford. With regard to the former we need only observe, that though his abilities had been unquestionably equal to the undertaking, yet at the advanced age of 74, and uninfluenced by any motive of personal animosity for engaging in such a task, we may rest perfectly satisfied that that suspicion was groundless. His Lordship's health was declining when Junius was in full possession of his bodily and mental faculties, and he expired in the 80th year of his age, a short time before Mr. Woodfall and Junius concluded their correspondence.

Lord Orford's claims are more worthy of attention. He was a man of very acute observation, was in the meridian of life, and was personally known to most of the leading characters of that day. On these accounts some have ventured to infer that he might be the author; but their style of writing is so dissimilar, their politi-

cal creeds so entirely at variance in many instances, and the circle of his friends so opposite to that of Junius, that on an attentive perusal of his "Memoirs and Correspondence", sufficient evidence appears to set the question at rest. These Memoirs extend to the close of the reign of George the Second, after which period he led a retired life at his favourite villa, Strawberry Hill, varying it, however, with occasional excursions to neighbouring counties and the Continent. In 1758, being then in the 42d year of his age, he says—"Arts, books, painting, architecture, antiquities, and those amiable employments of a tranquil life, to which in the warmest of his political hours he had been fondly addicted, assumed an entire empire over him. The circumstances too of the times contributed to make him withdraw from the scene of business." This resolution he strictly adhered to, for we find that he neither came forward in any public capacity, or united in any administration afterwards. Had he even attempted to alter this resolution, and had he been disappointed, a different class of men would certainly have fallen under his censure; for he lived on intimate terms with, and invariably speaks well of the Duke of Bedford, Lord Trentham, the Graftons, Lord Hertford, and others, against whom the pen of Junius is so freely exercised. On the

contrary, Sir Jeffery Amherst, George Grenville, and others, who are warmly applauded by Junius, are mentioned by his Lordship in terms of opprobrium and contempt. On referring to his correspondence with George Montague, Esq. General Conway, the Rev. Dr. Cole, &c. we find that during the period when Junius was so closely occupied in writing against the Government, Lord Orford's engagements were of a very different nature. His society was much sought after, for he possessed an infinite fund of anecdote, and was a great favourite with some old ladies residing at Richmond and its vicinity. He informs his correspondents of his various movements, so that we can with facility collect how and where he passed his time. He made several excursions to France, and the way in which he describes his adventures is highly amusing. Sept. 11, 1765, he writes to his friend General Conway from Amiens. He was then proceeding to Paris, on a visit to his friend Lord Hertford, who is treated by Junius with great severity. Lord Orford remained in France twelve months. Oct. 2, 1766, he informs General Conway that he is just returned. A fortnight afterwards we find him at Bath. March 12, 1768, he writes to George Montague, Esq., and in this letter takes an opportunity of applauding Lord Chatham and Charles Towns-

hend ; but of George Grenville he says, “ Will George Grenville cease to be the most tiresome of beings ? Will he not be constantly whining and droning, and interrupting ? ” Very different was the language of Junius, who just before had been satirizing the two former, and as warmly supporting the latter. Dec. 1, 1768, Lord Orford says, “ Oh, how delightful and comfortable to be sitting quietly here and scribbling to you, perfectly indifferent about both Houses ! ” From June 20 to July 15, 1769, we find him on a tour in Cambridgeshire. August 18, 1769, he writes from Calais, “ I think it conscientiously right to inform you that I am not in Arlington-street, nor at Strawberry Hill, nor even in Middlesex ; nay, not in England. I am—I am—guess where ? Not in Corsica, nor at Spa. Stay—I am not at Paris yet, but I hope to be there in two days. In short, I am at Calais, having landed about two hours ago, after a tedious passage of nine hours. ” He remained in Paris about a month, and reached home Oct. 13, 1769, having been absent nearly two months. During this period the controversy between Sir W. Draper and Junius took place. June 11, 1770, he tells his friend not to expect long letters from him, being very busily engaged in preparing his last volume of *Painters*. From July 1 to July 7, 1770, he was on a visit in Bucking-

hamshire. Nov. 20, 1770, he writes, "My last volume of *Painters* begins to print this week." From July 30, 1771, to Sept. 7, 1771, he was again in Paris. During this period the controversy between Junius and the Rev. Mr. Horne took place.

By this statement we clearly prove that the suspicions entertained that Lord Orford was Junius are totally unfounded. He was one of the last men who would be likely to undertake so arduous a task, having various other literary subjects constantly engaging his attention. For the satisfaction of those who lay any stress upon handwriting we may also add, that that of Lord Orford and Junius were totally dissimilar.

During my research I have observed hints suggested in favour of the present claimant, with remarks of his having been strongly suspected; but in no one instance have I ever met with an investigation of those claims, or an attempt to disprove those suspicions, further than from general surmise. These have invariably died away, so that the present Enquiry, as it is the only one which has ever been systematically entered into, will afford full scope for fair criticism and investigation.

The reader who may still be biassed in favour of any of the foregoing names, can compare such pretensions with the result of my Enquiry,

on an attentive perusal of the Letters: from which I deduce this opinion;

That no one has any claim to the authorship of the Letters of Junius, of whom the following testimonials cannot be produced:

I. That he was an Englishman.

II. That he was a man of rank, and of independent fortune.

III. That he was a man of highly cultivated talents, and of superior education; that he had successfully studied the language, the law, the constitution, and the history of his native country; but that he was neither a lawyer nor a clergyman.

IV. That he either was, at the time of writing the Letters, or had previously been in the army, is evident from *his practical knowledge of military affairs*.

V. That he moved in the immediate circle of the Court.

VI. That he was a member of the established church.

VII. That he was a member of the House of Commons.

VIII. That from the early information Junius obtained on Government affairs, it is evident he was connected with some persons in administration.

IX. That he was a firm friend to Sir Jeffery [afterwards Lord] Amherst.

X. That he was a friend to Colonel Cunningham.

XI. That he was an admirer of Mr. Grenville.

XII. That he was a strong advocate for the Stamp Act in America.

XIII. That he was in favour of repealing the duty on tea in America.

XIV. That he was an advocate for triennial parliaments.

XV. That he considered the impeachment of Lord Mansfield as indispensable.

XVI. That from the manner in which he upholds rotten boroughs, it is highly probable they either constituted part of his property, or that he was in some way connected with them.

XVII. That he considered a strict regard should be paid to the public expenditure, that the national debt might not be increased.

XVIII. That he was against disbanding the army, although a firm friend to the marching regiments; he was also in favour of impressing seamen.

XIX. That he must have had an antipathy to Sir Fletcher Norton, the Speaker of the House of Commons, from the contempt with which he speaks of him.

XX. That he was necessarily a friend to his printer, Mr. Woodfall.

XXI. That he must have resided almost wholly in London, from his correspondence with Mr. Woodfall, to whom he gives notice when he occasionally goes into the country. One of his letters being dated Pall Mall, we may fairly presume his town house was in that street.

XXII. That from his remembrance of the Walpolean battles, his seeing the Jesuitical books burnt in Paris, and his avowal of a long experience of the world, as well as from other circumstances mentioned in his correspondence with Mr. Wilkes, he could not be less than fifty years of age at the time of writing these Letters.

XXIII. That from the hints given to his printer, Mr. Woodfall, we may infer arrangements had been made for his coming into office; which though not accepted by him at the time, were sufficiently important to induce him to write no more.

XXIV. Finally, that so powerful an attack on the *private character* of persons of such high rank, being inconsistent with the pen of political writers, in general, who condemn measures, and not character; we may reasonably conclude, that they proceeded from the pen of one who had received a severe wound from some of those individuals who formed part of the existing administration.

From these articles we may, at one view, collect the leading principles of Junius, which Horne Tooke candidly informed him would suit no form of government; indeed many of them appear highly inconsistent with so popular a writer;—nevertheless, all which testimonials I have proved are united in the person of Lord Viscount Sackville, with many other documents connected with the life of that extraordinary man, as explanatory of the *causes* which occupied his pen for upwards of four years in one continued strain of personal satire and invective against the parties who censured his conduct at Minden, in Germany, and who were accessory to his second dismissal in 1766. His interview also with Lord Mansfield, a few days previous to his death, is another extraordinary circumstance, which cannot be accounted for on any other supposition than the sense he entertained of the injury his pen had inflicted on that nobleman, and his unwillingness to leave the world without making him some acknowledgment.

I therefore submit my Enquiry to the public, with confidence that this grand literary desideratum is now fully established; the mystery unravelled; and that the veil which has so long obscured the person of this illustrious writer, is removed for ever.

During my investigation, a book was put into my hands, written with sound judgment and

great ability, by Charles Butler, Esq. of Lincoln's Inn, which contains an interesting Enquiry as to the Author of Junius, undertaken in unison with Mr. Wilkes. The result of their labours amounted to nothing conclusive. The author afterwards touches upon the claims of Mr. Burke, Mr. Glover, Sir P. Francis, and Lord George Sackville, of whom he says:—

“The reminiscent well remembers that his Lordship was the person to whom the Letters were first attributed, and that his Lordship had the reputation of possessing literary talents and habits. It is known that Sir William Draper at first divided his suspicions of the authorship of Junius between Burke and Lord George, and that, on Burke's unequivocal denial of it, he transferred them wholly to his Lordship.

“There certainly was an event in his Lordship's life which would sour him against mankind, and fill his soul with bitter hatred against the King in whose reign it happened, and his immediate successor on the throne; against Lord Mansfield, their secret and confidential adviser in all state prosecutions; and against the Duke of Grafton, the brother of Lord Southampton, a strong witness against Lord George in the court-martial which was held upon him. Something or other might easily have occurred which would have extended this hatred to the Duke of Bedford.

“ The event to which we have referred would render concealment necessary ; and after Lord George had taken an office in Lord North’s administration, and accepted a peerage from the King, it must, if he had any feelings of honour, have made him desire that his authorship of the Letters of Junius, if he were the author of them, should be buried in eternal oblivion.

“ To all arguments which may be suggested in favour of Lord George, the author of the ingenious Essay prefixed to Woodfall’s edition of the Letters of Junius, objects an expression in a political squib, *attributed* to Junius, in which he alludes to the supposed tergiversation of Lord George at the battle of Minden. This may be thought a strong, but it evidently is not a decisive argument, particularly if we suppose, what certainly is not impossible, that Lord George had, upon this subject, all the pride of conscious innocence. It must also be observed, *that it is by conjecture only*, that the jeu d’esprit, in which this expression is found, is imputed to Junius.”

The latter part of the above sentence will be found in unison with my own opinion, expressed hereafter, where I have given evident demonstration that the jeu d’esprit alluded to *did not* proceed from the pen of Junius. I do not offer this extract, containing Mr. Butler’s private opinion, as any demonstration in support of his Lordship’s

claims, although it is in itself much to the point. No proofs are adduced by him. Private opinion, on a subject of so much intricacy, avails but little, unless substantiated by corroborating circumstances.

Horne Tooke says, in his answer to Junius, "You have disappointed me. When I told you that *surmise*, in however elegant language, ought not to pass for *proof*, I evidently hinted at the reply which I expected." And to this principle it has been my endeavour to adhere, that the same language might not be advanced against the contents of this volume.

I now take this opportunity of offering my acknowledgment of thanks to my friend William Little, Esq. of Richmond, for his liberality in granting me the loan of many valuable books connected with the subject, and for his readiness in obtaining information for me, necessary to the furtherance of the present undertaking; also for granting me a fac-simile of his Lordship's hand-writing when Secretary of State, which is affixed to an official document preserved among his valuable collection of Autographs.

To Mr. G. Woodfall I have also to present my thanks for his politeness in answering my enquiries on the subject; and for the readiness he evinced to shew me the original letters in his possession. Several were sent by the penny-

post, and others were dropped into the letter-box in the window of the office. They were folded small and enclosed in an envelope. This was the invariable custom of Lord Viscount Sackville. The one that I noticed most particularly, was that sealed with a coat of arms, of which a fac-simile is already given by Mr. Woodfall, but no farther trace of such arms could be made out than what is already engraved. I asked him, candidly to inform me, whether he believed his father was acquainted with the name of his correspondent: to which he replied, "that to a certainty, he was not, although his father, at times, suspected Lord George Sackville."

He admitted, after all, that it was only matter of surmise, as both himself and his father had no farther means of ascertaining who the writer was than any other private individuals. He assured me that he was ready and willing at all times to give any information that lay in his power, it being a curious question which he should feel much pleasure in seeing correctly ascertained. There was nothing disguised in his remarks, nor did he evince any hesitation to shew me the documents in his possession: he behaved in the most gentlemanly manner, and has my acknowledgments for his readiness to assist me.

The signature of the noble Lord, when Secre-

tary of State (at which period he was Lord George Germain), I did not consider a sufficient specimen of his autography to affix to the publication, although it corresponds exactly with the description of Junius's hand-writing given by Charles Butler, Esq. of Lincoln's Inn:—

“ It is like that which well educated ladies wrote about the beginning of the century: a large open hand, regular, approaching to the Italian.”

I may just remark that this description varies considerably from the specimens given by Mr. Woodfall, some of which are particularly small. This peculiarity of difference of size is also strikingly observable in Lord Sackville's autography. I have lately seen some of his letters written in a small hand, others full twice the size.

Understanding that the family still possessed documents of great interest, and considering the political ferment of the day too long subsided to awaken any unpleasant feelings, I resolved to write candidly to the Duke of Dorset on the subject.

I stated to his Grace, that I was engaged in a literary enquiry, with which his illustrious father was intimately connected, and should feel particularly obliged by his permitting me to see the letters which were written by Lord George from Culloden and Minden; hoping that the

liberality which so conspicuously characterizes the nobility of the present day, in elucidation of any literary pursuit, would plead as an excuse for my freedom in thus addressing him. It is from such authentic sources alone, that we have an opportunity of gaining a correct account of interesting events, upon which history is too often silent, or of which it merely records the dates and a few leading facts. The world at large is, in general, guided by the statements of biographers or historians; and we know that particular circumstances are often misrepresented, which evidence of this nature would satisfactorily explain. This was the object I had in view.

I subsequently waited on his Grace by appointment. He received me in the most polite manner, but told me it was out of his power to render me assistance, not having any of his father's letters in his possession. Upon the whole he considered, that as the affair in question was now at rest, it would be as well not to revive it, lest animadversions should be made that would tend to recall past events. His Grace more than once observed during the interview, that his father was an injured man; but he believed there never existed one who naturally possessed a better or more susceptible heart. I told him that this was my firm belief, and that the En-

quiry in which I was engaged, would not, in the slightest degree, tend to alter that opinion.

It is a fair field for literary investigation, which has been entered by many other competitors, so that I cannot see any necessity for withholding from the public the result of my labours, which has been accomplished with so great a share of time, expense, and trouble; nevertheless, I should be extremely sorry to wound the feelings of any one, could I for a moment suppose, that the present disclosure would have that effect: on the contrary, I consider that it will operate in every way the reverse; and that the name of Lord Viscount Sackville, which at present lies buried in comparative obscurity, will be handed down to posterity with as much dignity and splendour as other branches of his noble family, who stand pre-eminent in the literary world, for their talents, learning, and sound judgment.

I afterwards succeeded in obtaining a letter written by Lord George to the Secretary at War, Lord Barrington, on his dismissal from his Majesty's service. It was written *previously* to his trial, and I have inserted it in the summary of his life, to shew his connexion with Lord Barrington, who waited on him on the occasion of his delivering up his commissions. Other motives of personal dislike occurred afterwards,

which were aggravated by the result of his trial. It also tends to shew that his disgust to the Government was not without cause, as his dismissal from all his emoluments took place before he had an opportunity of clearing his character from the false imputations which had been so maliciously raised against it. This original letter is deposited in the War Office. I am indebted for a copy of it to the politeness of Lord Palmerston, and to Mr. Coleman, who interested himself on my behalf.

A few days after the date of this letter, Lord George wrote to his brother-in-law, Lord Viscount Bateman, complaining of so wanton an exercise of the prerogative, in dismissing him from the army before trial. He writes with all the feelings of an injured man, conscious of his own innocence; and concludes by hoping that so dangerous a precedent "may not excite alarm." The original letter (of which a true copy is inserted in the summary of his Lordship's life) is in the possession of W. Little, Esq. Other familiar letters, previous to this unfortunate affair, will also be read with interest. They were written to his intimate friend Major Younge, during the Rebellion in Scotland, and throw some light on his antipathy to that nation. In one of them, dated from Perth, he even goes so far as to avow that nothing but another rebellion would

ever tempt him to take up his quarters in Scotland again ; so that in after years, when faction prevailed, and many leading families of that country were avowedly his enemies, we cease to wonder that this antipathy was increased to extreme aversion and disgust. The fac-simile of his Lordship's handwriting annexed to this volume, is also taken from a letter to Major Younge. The reader will perceive, on a comparison with Mr. Woodfall's specimens, that there is a striking resemblance, the same peculiarities existing in each. It is proper, however, to observe, that Junius lays great stress on the pains he took in *correcting* and *transcribing*. In a private letter to Mr. Woodfall, No. 9., he says, "You shall have it some time to-morrow night : it cannot be *corrected* and *copied* sooner." Again, No. 24., "The inclosed, though begun within these few days, has been greatly laboured. *It is very correctly copied.*"

Several other instances might be adduced, but these are sufficient to shew that a very close resemblance can hardly be expected between them ; one being written in a familiar, careless manner, and the others, both with regard to style and writing, *greatly laboured*.

Nevertheless, most of the words which I have selected to compare with those of Junius bear so close a resemblance, particularly where there

is any peculiarity, that the reader will probably be convinced they were written by one and the same person.

Lastly, we may observe, that the handwriting is but a secondary object. We are not so much labouring to establish the autography as the authorship of the Letters, which is, I presume, sufficiently proved by the internal evidence, without this additional testimony.

Wandsworth Common, 1825.

A
CRITICAL ENQUIRY
INTO THE
LETTERS OF JUNIUS.

1

ENQUIRY,

ETC.

CHAPTER I.

It was an accidental circumstance which induced me to enter into the present enquiry. One evening in company, the conversation turned on Voltaire's *Siècle de Louis XIV. et XV.*, more particularly on those parts of the work, where that elegant historian so pathetically describes the hardships, sufferings, and obstacles of the Pretender. "Que les hommes privés," he observes, "qui se plaignent de leurs petites infortunes, jettent les yeux sur ce prince et ses ancêtres."—Comments were also made on the war in America and Germany, during the reign of George the Second. Finally, on Voltaire's candid confession that "La bataille que les François perdirent aupres de Minden en 1759, et les autres échecs qu'ils essuyèrent, les firent retrograder."

The affair at Minden and its subsequent consequences convinced me that Lord George Sackville was the author of the *Letters of Junius*;

as it is an axiom in philosophy that effects are produced by antecedent causes. I noted down all the particulars I could collect, connected with this extraordinary event, and shall state them as briefly as possible, as the foundation on which our theory is established.

The Marquis of Granby, at the head of six regiments of British infantry, assisted by only two regiments of Hanoverian guards, undertook to charge the enemy's centre, composed of sixty squadrons of cavalry: and, to the honour of this little corps, they drove the enemy from the field, without any other assistance than what they received from the artillery of their own country. The whole of the allied army was under the command of Prince Ferdinand; the British forces under Lord George Sackville, whose instructions from his government were, to obey the orders of the prince, as commander-in-chief.

Either from the confused statements of two of Prince Ferdinand's aids-de-camp (the Hon. Lieutenant-Colonel Fitzroy, brother to the Duke of Grafton, and Lieutenant-Colonel Edward Ligonier), or from some misunderstanding between Lord George Sackville, the Marquis of Granby, and Prince Ferdinand, previous to the battle; the British cavalry, commanded by Lord George, was not brought into action. There were some expressions in the orders for rejoicing

after the victory, which were supposed to convey a very severe censure on Lord George, for disobedience of orders. Prince Ferdinand, in an emphatical manner, desired that his orders, for the future, might be more particularly obeyed. He also observed, "I regret that the Marquis of Granby had not the command of the British cavalry. Had he commanded, I make no doubt the success of the day had been much more complete and brilliant."

This severe reflection, the high spirit of Lord George, who had been twenty-two years in the army, could not brook, and a violent quarrel ensued between the parties. His contempt for Prince Ferdinand, his jealousy of the Marquis of Granby's fame, his detestation of the Graftons, made so deep an impression upon him, that he left the continent and returned home, where he found his character already sullied, and himself stamped with opprobrium as a coward and a dishonour to his country. Conscious of his own innocence, he wrote a short address, requesting the public to suspend its judgement until he had an opportunity of defending himself.

"The various reports that have been propagated to my disadvantage, and the many falsehoods which have been asserted to ruin my character, lay me under the necessity of remaining not entirely silent; though I am debarred at

present from stating my case to the public, as I should have done, had I not had assurances of obtaining a court-martial for my trial, the only legal and effectual method of convincing the world how little foundation there has been for the torrent of calumny and abuse which has been so maliciously thrown out against me.

“I had rather, upon this occasion, submit myself to all the inconveniences that may arise from the want of style, than borrow assistance from the pen of others, as I can have no hopes of establishing my character, but from the force of truth. I shall, therefore, as plainly and as distinctly as possible, relate a few circumstances, which will at least shew that no one could be more desirous than I was to bring truth to light, and subject my conduct to the strictest scrutiny.

“The instant I found, by the implied censure given out in orders the 2d of August, that my conduct had appeared in an unfavourable light to Prince Ferdinand on the day of action, I endeavoured to inform myself in what particular I had either failed or neglected my duty. I heard, in general, of disobedience of orders; but I could fix no certain period of time to my supposed crime, till Colonel Fitzroy acquainted me with what had passed between his Serene Highness and himself, in regard to the orders delivered to me by Colonel Fitzroy that day.

“Whenever my trial comes, I shall endeavour to clear up that point to the satisfaction of the public: my own assertions may have little weight, but the oaths of witnesses, whose veracity cannot be called in question, will, I trust, prove my innocence beyond the possibility of a doubt.

“Under these circumstances, I immediately applied for his Majesty’s permission to return to England, that I might answer any accusation that should be brought against me. For as commander-in-chief of the British forces in Germany, no person there could order a court-martial for my trial, had there been any accusation laid: the power of summoning courts-martial, and approving their sentences, being vested in me by my commission: and no British officer or soldier could be tried by any other authority. As soon as I arrived in London on Friday evening, the 7th, I instantly wrote the following letter to the Secretary of State:

‘MY LORD,

‘I HAVE the honour of acquainting your lordship with my arrival in England, in pursuance of his Majesty’s permission sent to me, at my request, by your lordship.

‘I thought myself much injured abroad by an implied censure upon my conduct: I find I

am still more unfortunate at home, by being publicly represented as having neglected my duty by disobeying the positive orders of his Serene Highness Prince Ferdinand. As I am conscious of neither neglect nor disobedience of orders; as I am certain I did my duty to the best of my abilities; and as I am persuaded that the prince himself would have found that he had no just cause of complaint against me, had he condescended to have enquired into my conduct, before he had expressed his disapprobation of it from the partial representation of others: I therefore most humbly request that I may at least have a public opportunity given me of attempting to justify myself to his Majesty and to my country, by a court-martial being appointed; that, if I am guilty, I may suffer such punishment as I may have deserved; and if innocent, that I may stand acquitted in the opinion of the world. But it is really too severe to have been censured unheard, to have been condemned before I was tried, and to be informed neither of my crime nor of my accusers.

‘ I am, my Lord,

‘ &c. &c. &c.

‘ GEORGE SACKVILLE.’

‘ To Lord Holderness.’

“ I received an answer to this letter on Monday the 10th, in which I was assured, that a court-martial would be granted, as soon as the officers capable of giving evidence could leave their posts, but *previously to the receipt of that letter, I was dismissed from all my military employments.* Notwithstanding which dismissal, I still hope and am informed that I may have the advantage of a legal trial.

“ In the mean time, the only indulgence I have to ask is, that the public will suspend its judgment till such facts can be produced, from which alone the truth can appear. But if plans of a battle are to be referred to, which can give no just idea of it; if dispositions of the cavalry and the infantry are supposed which never existed; if orders for attacks and pursuits are quoted which never were delivered; and if disobedience to those *imaginary* orders are asserted as a crime: what can an injured officer, under such circumstances, have recourse to, but claiming that justice which is due to every Englishman, of being heard before he is condemned? The sooner that happens, the happier I shall be; as I am conscious my innocence must appear, when real facts are truly stated and fully proved.

“ GEORGE SACKVILLE.”

Previous to his leaving the continent, he

wrote a letter to Colonel Fitzroy, demanding an explanation, why his name was omitted in the orders for rejoicing; to which the colonel returned the following answer:

“Minden, Aug. 3, 1759.

“MY LORD,

“HIS Serene Highness, upon some report made to him by the Duke of Richmond of the situation of the enemy, sent Captain Ligonier and myself with orders for the British cavalry to advance. His Serene Highness was at this instant one or two brigades beyond the English infantry, towards the left. Upon my arrival on the right of the cavalry, I found Captain Ligonier with your lordship. Notwithstanding, I declared his Serene Highness's orders to you; upon which you desired I would not be in a hurry: I made answer, that galloping had put me out of breath, which made me speak very quick. I then repeated the orders for the British cavalry to advance toward the left, and at the same time, mentioning the circumstance that occasioned the orders, added, ‘That it was a glorious opportunity for the English to distinguish themselves, and that your lordship, by leading them on, would gain immortal honour.’ You yet expressed your surprise at the orders (*as they differed so materially from what Captain*

Ligonier had just brought), saying, it was impossible the duke could mean to break the line. My answer was, that I delivered his Serene Highness's orders, word for word as he gave them. Upon which you asked which way the cavalry was to march and who was to be their guide. I undertook to lead them towards the left, round the little wood on their left, as they were then drawn up, where they might be little exposed to the enemy's cannonade. Your lordship continued to think my orders neither clear nor exactly delivered; and, expressing your desire to see Prince Ferdinand, ordered me to lead you to him; which order I was obeying, when we met his Serene Highness. During this time I did not see the cavalry advance. Captain Smith, one of your aids-de-camp, once or twice made me repeat the orders I had before delivered to your lordship, and I hope he will do me the justice to say they were clear and exact. He went up to you whilst we were going to find the duke, as I imagine, being sensible of the clearness of my orders and the necessity of their being immediately obeyed. I heard your lordship give him some orders. What they were I cannot say: but he immediately rode back towards the cavalry. Upon my joining the duke, I repeated to him the orders I had delivered to you; and, appealing to his Serene High-

ness to know whether they were the same he had honoured me with, I had the satisfaction to hear him declare they were very exact. His Serene Highness immediately asked where the cavalry was; and upon my making answer that Lord George did not understand the orders, but was coming to speak to his Serene Highness, he expressed his surprise strongly.

“I hope your lordship will think I did nothing but my duty as aid-de-camp, in mentioning to his Serene Highness my orders being so much questioned by your lordship.

“I am, &c. &c. &c.

“FITZROY.”

To this letter, we may remark that Lord George was not present when the conversation took place between Colonel Fitzroy and Prince Ferdinand; Fitzroy having rode on before, to say Lord George was coming. He was conscious on his arrival that the prince, the Marquis of Granby, and Colonel Fitzroy had endeavoured to mislead him.

From the misunderstanding on this occasion, connected with other circumstances in the cabinet, may be attributed his virulent animosity towards the parties, which was afterwards so strongly manifested. Nothing so fully corroborates this statement as the circumstance of his

being deprived of all his military honours, as well as other situations which he held under government, previous to any examination into his conduct or granting him a legal trial.

On Friday the 7th of March, 1760, on the return of the troops from Germany, a court-martial was held, agreeably to the Secretary of State's promise. It consisted of sixteen officers, and the deputy judge-advocate-general. Ten out of this number were Scotchmen, as well as several of the officers who gave their evidence against him. This may partly account for his antipathy to that nation, to which the pen of Junius gives no quarter, but satirises with the keenest invective and acrimony. Nor did it require this instance of personal bias. His residence in Scotland for twelve months, when fighting under the Duke of Cumberland against the rebels, was a sufficient cause of enmity on both sides. It was during this campaign that he was witness to Lord Ravensworth's assertion of Lord Mansfield having drank the Pretender's health on his knees; with other circumstances alluded to by Junius, which it was utterly impossible any one could have been acquainted with, who had not fought against the Pretender. Lord Ravensworth's testimony afterwards, in 1753, before the privy council, convicted Andrew Stone, brother to the primate of Ireland, as well as

Lord Mansfield. Now the primate was well known to Lord George, and might have confirmed this testimony. The examination of these Jacobites forms a conspicuous event in Lord Orford's Memoirs.

The most important witnesses on his trial were the Marquis of Granby, Lieutenant-Colonel Fitzroy, brother to the Duke of Grafton, and Lieut.-Colonel William Augustus Pitt. These families stand pre-eminent in Junius's letters. A careful perusal of the trial, and a knowledge of the parties connected with it, must convince every reader that the pen of a disgraced soldier was afterwards exercised in retaliation; not one family being spared who had any share in the transaction; and what is particularly worthy of notice, nearly the whole of the names on whom Junius is most severe, were military characters, or connected with the army in one way or another. Lord Mansfield is however one of the exceptions. Party spirit then ran very high, and any imprudent interference of that nobleman might easily have verified the truth of Junius's assertion, viz. "I see through your whole life one uniform plan to enlarge the power of the crown, at the expense of the liberty of the subject. To this object, your thoughts, words, and actions have been constantly directed."—Letter XLI.

The press at this time teemed with the most vindictive pamphlets; during which period Lord George himself was not idle. He wrote several letters to the Secretary of State, and other members of the privy council. I have seen a book wherein the government is more severely satirised, if possible, than in any of the letters of Junius. Similar allusions induce me to believe it proceeded from the same source. So severe were many of the passages, that Lord Mansfield endeavoured to lay further restrictions on the press, but the ingenuity of the writer baffled all attempts at discovery, and he came off victorious.

On what occasion Lord Mansfield first gave offence to Lord George Sackville, we have no means of ascertaining, except the disappointment he felt when his sentence was pronounced, Lord Mansfield having assured him previously to his trial, that he could not be convicted. This circumstance would naturally lower Lord Mansfield in his esteem, as I have never been able to trace any friendship (which Lord Orford mentions previous to his trial) subsisting between Lord George and Lord Mansfield after this event; on the contrary, after Lord Mansfield's charge to the jury on Woodfall's trial, we find Junius's severe letter to that nobleman, and at the same time a most violent and satirical speech of Lord George in the House of Com-

mons, considering it indispensably necessary that his conduct should be enquired into.

The tenor of that speech proves that no friendship subsisted between them at that time. Nevertheless, conscious that he had carried his resentment to too great a height, we find Lord George, previous to his death, sending Mr. Cumberland expressly for Lord Mansfield, that he might not leave the world without asking his forgiveness.

I said his trial came on March 7, 1760. Lord George conducted his defence himself, and refuted in the most able manner the aspersions that had been urged against him; concluding with these memorable words:—

“If there are contradictions in the evidence, that imputation must fall somewhere; let it fall where it ought. Let those who have sworn falsely, feel it in their breasts. Let them remember they have sworn wrong: let them feel the effects of it: this is punishment. A guilty and a disturbed conscience will inflict that punishment, without any other resort. Let it light where it is due. Let them examine their hearts, whether they have given their evidence as they ought: *Let them, if they can, spend their lives without being punished.*”

The result of the trial was as follows.

“This Court, upon due consideration of the

whole matter before them, is of opinion that Lord George Sackville is guilty of having disobeyed the orders of Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick, whom he was, by his commission and instructions, directed to obey as commander-in-chief, according to the rules of war ; and it is the farther opinion of this court, that the said Lord George Sackville is, and he is hereby adjudged, unfit to serve his Majesty in any military capacity whatever."

Which sentence was confirmed by the king :

" It is his Majesty's pleasure that the above sentence be given out in public orders, that officers, being convinced that neither high birth nor great employments can shelter offences of such a nature ; and that seeing they are subject to censures much worse than death, to a man who has any sense of honour, they may avoid the fatal consequences arising from disobedience of orders."

This addition to his sentence by the executive power, was considered by Lord George as a measure highly derogatory to the king, and reprehensible on the part of ministers, who advised it. It fully tended to convince him there was a secret intrigue in the cabinet, to ruin his character for ever. The sentence in itself, amounted to no more than the verdict of the jury in the case of Junius's letter to the king: yet how widely different the result! In the former, no

act of cowardice is proved, nor any unwillingness displayed to share in the combat. In the latter, no libellous matter is proved, merely guilty of printing and publishing. Woodfall's sentence was nominal. But in the case of Lord George, his name was erased from the privy council list, he was stripped of all his emoluments under government, and declared incapable of serving his Majesty in any military capacity whatever. His enemies did not even wait till the result of his trial was known, but deputed the Honourable John Barrington to signify to him that his services were no longer required ; so that, in fact, the law was arbitrarily infringed upon to gratify private resentment. The places held by Lord George were bestowed by the king on those very men who had given evidence against him. The Marquis of Granby was appointed commander-in-chief and master-general of the ordnance. Lord Townshend, lieutenant-general of the ordnance. The Honourable Colonel Fitzroy was appointed aide-de-camp to the king, and one of the grooms of the bed-chamber, in conjunction with the Earl of Chatham and Lord North. Lord Charles Manners and the Honourable John Barrington, were promoted at the same time : as well as the Duke of Bedford, who was made a lieutenant-general in the army, and deputy-ranger of the Phoenix Park, Dublin, which had been Lord

George's sinecure for many years. Johnston, Elliot, and many other officers, were promoted, whom Junius mentions with the highest contempt. In fine, as I observed before, not one man connected with Lord George's trial escaped retaliation and personal censure afterwards.

The reader will observe that Lord Barrington of the War Office, had also written to Lord George, signifying that his Majesty had no further occasion for his services as lieutenant-general and colonel of dragoon guards, which communication Lord George acknowledged by the following letter.

“ Pall-Mall, September 11, 1759.

“ MY LORD,

“ I HAVE received the honor of your lordship's letter, signifying to me his Majesty has no further occasion for my service, as lieutenant-general and colonel of dragoon guards.

“ If I were conscious of having deserved this mark of his Majesty's displeasure I should be most unhappy ; as it is, I only regret that I shall have no further opportunity of exerting my zeal in the service of my king and country.

“ I am, my lord, &c. &c.

“ GEORGE SACKVILLE.”

“ To Lord Barrington.”

The name of Barrington stands conspicuous among the catalogue of Junius's enemies. He served on the continent with Lord George, and was afterwards appointed to the War Office, a situation which was offered to Lord George himself previous to his disgrace.

Junius says, "poor B—ch for many years was his nickname. His time-serving duplicity is now so well known, that he seldom speaks without being laughed at. Sometimes his folly exceeds all bounds; as for instance, when he traduced the whole body of general officers, which, I presume, they will not readily forget."—Miscel. Letter cxiii.

"I desire you will inform the public that the worthy Lord Barrington, not contented with having driven Mr. D'Oyley out of the War Office, has at last contrived to expel Mr. Francis."—Letter cx. 23 March, 1772.

It is highly probable that they both unguardedly gave information to Lord George, which was useful to him in his character of Junius, and which in an indirect manner might have been the cause of their removal from the War Office. In confirmation of this opinion, we find, that Mr. D'Oyley was afterwards private secretary to Lord George, and Sir Philip Francis obtained an appointment in India.

I have stated in the preface, that it was not

my intention to enter into the claims of others. They have all been ably refuted, excepting the last candidate, Sir Philip Francis, whose claims have only been noticed by the Edinburgh Reviewers. Those learned critics have not gone systematically into the question, but have been guided by the ingenuity of the volume laid before them. As they have not come to any satisfactory conclusion, I shall merely state a few facts here, which will at once shew, that it is idle for a moment to suppose that Sir Philip had any claim whatever to the authorship of the letters, more than Mr. D'Oyley, or any other person whom Junius may have casually mentioned.

Sir Philip Francis was patronized and encouraged by the Earl of Chatham, and it was through his patronage that Sir Philip became secretary to General Bligh. By the same recommendation he was afterwards appointed secretary to the Earl of Kinnoul, ambassador to Lisbon. Let us hear the opinion which Junius entertained of the Earl of Chatham.

Vol. I. p. 213, private letter to Mr. Woodfall,—

(PRIVATE.)

“ Friday Morning, Oct. 19, 1770.

“ BY your affected silence, you encourage an idle opinion that I am the author of the Whig, &c. though you very well know the contrary. I

neither admire the writer nor his idol." [*The Earl of Chatham.*].—No. 23.

Vol. II. p. 452.—“ Without any uncommon depravity of mind, a man so trusted might lose all ideas of public principle or gratitude, and not unreasonably exert himself to perpetuate a power, which he saw his fellow-citizens weak and abject enough to surrender to him. But if, instead of a man of a common mixed character, whose vices might be redeemed by some appearance of virtue and generosity, it should have unfortunately happened that a nation had placed all their confidence in a man purely and perfectly bad; if a great and good prince, by some fatal delusion had made choice of such a man for his first minister, and had delegated all his authority to him, what security would that nation have for its freedom, or that prince for his crown? The history of every nation, that once had a claim to liberty, will tell us what would be the progress of such a traitor [the Earl of Chatham], and what the probable event of his crimes.

“ Let us suppose him arrived at that moment, at which he might see himself within reach of the great object *to which all the artifices, the intrigues, the hypocrisy and the impudence of his past life were directed.* On the point of having the whole power of the crown committed to him,

what would be his conduct? An affectation of prostrate humility in the closet, but a lordly dictation of terms to the people, by whose interest he had been supported, by whose fortunes he had subsisted. Has he a brother? that brother must be sacrificed. Has he a rancorous enemy? that enemy must be promoted. Have years of his life been spent in declaiming against the pernicious influence of a favourite? that favourite must be taken to his bosom, and made the only partner of his power. But it is in the natural course of things, that a despotic power, which of itself violates every principle of a free constitution should be acquired by means, which equally violate every principle of honour and morality. The office of a grand vizir is inconsistent with a limited monarchy, and can never subsist long, but by its destruction. The same measures by which an abandoned profligate is advanced to power, must be observed to maintain him in it. *The principal nobility, who might disdain to submit to the upstart insolence of a dictator, must be removed from every post of honour and authority,*" &c.

Vol. II. p. 510.—“ I will not suppose that the bulk of the British people is sunk into so criminal a state of stupidity: that there does exist a particular set of men, base and treacherous enough to have enlisted under the banners of a lunatic

[the Earl of Chatham], to whom they sacrificed their honour, their conscience, and their country, in order to carry a point of party, *and to gratify a personal rancour*, is a truth too melancholy and too certain for Great Britain. These were the wretched ministers, who served at the altar, whilst *the high priest himself*, with more than frantic fury offered up his bleeding country a victim to America.”

Letter XI. Dec. 22, 1767, p. 515, is also in the same strain.

Vol. III. p. 108.—“I think I have now named all the cabinet but the Earl of Chatham. His infirmities have forced him into a retirement where I presume he is ready to suffer, *with a sullen submission, every insult and disgrace that can be heaped upon a miserable, decrepid, worn out old man*. But it is impossible he should be so far active in his own dishonour, as to advise the taking away an employment, given as a reward for the first military success that distinguished his entrance into administration. *He is indeed a compound of contradictions*, but his letter to Sir Jeffery Amherst stands upon record, and is not to be explained away. You know, my Lord, that Mr. Pitt therein assured Sir Jeffery Amherst, that the government of Virginia was given him merely as a reward, and solemnly pledged the royal faith that his residence should never be re-

quired. Lost as he is, he would not dare to contradict this letter. If he did, it would be something more than madness. The disorder must have quitted his head, and fixed itself in his heart."

Vol. III. p. 174. — "The Earl of Chatham— I had much to say, but it were inhuman to persecute, when Providence has marked out the example to mankind!"

These extracts are sufficient to shew that Sir Philip Francis and Junius were two distinct persons. Could Sir Philip Francis have made use of such language against the very man who had brought him forward in the world? It is contrary to reason and common sense.

The writer of the article in the *Edinburgh Review* for November 1817, has blended Sir Philip Francis with the speeches of the Earl of Chatham, which have nothing whatever to do with the question, any further than that Junius may have borrowed some of his ideas from Lord Chatham's eloquence, as he evidently did from other distinguished characters. The line of politics pursued by Junius and the Earl of Chatham, was totally different on American taxation, which of itself shews there was no connexion between them.

Sir Philip Francis, on the contrary, was an enthusiastic admirer of the Earl of Chatham. On

the decease of that nobleman, he passed a high eulogium on his character, and observed that he had left no one behind him that bore any resemblance to him. Sir Philip had just cause for this opinion, having been raised to the station he then held in society through that nobleman's interest.

Junius had cause for his invective against the Earl of Chatham. The prominent part which he (when Mr. Pitt) took against Lord George Sackville after the unfortunate affair at Minden, would naturally sour him against that distinguished statesman, however highly he might admire *his abilities*. Junius admired the *abilities* of Lord Mansfield, but he detested the *man*.

On Sir Philip Francis's return from Lisbon, he was recommended to the notice of Welbore Ellis, afterwards Lord Mendip, who was at that time secretary at war. This gentleman also warmly patronized him, and gave him an important situation in his office. Junius invariably speaks of Welbore Ellis with the utmost contempt.—Vol. II. p. 128.—“The little dignity of Mr. Ellis has been committed; the mine was sunk, combustibles provided, and Welbore Ellis, the Guy Faux of the fable, waited only for the signal of command. All of a sudden the country gentlemen discover how grossly they have been deceived; the minister's heart fails him, the

grand plot is defeated in a moment, and poor Mr. Ellis and his motion taken into custody. From the event of Friday last, one would imagine that some fatality hung over this gentleman. Whether he makes or suppresses a motion, he is equally sure of his disgrace. But the complexion of the times will suffer no man to be vice-treasurer of Ireland with impunity.”

“About this time the courtiers talked of nothing but a bill of pains and penalties against the Lord Mayor and Sheriffs, or impeachment at the least. Little Mannikin Ellis told the king, that if the business were left to his management he would engage to do wonders. It was thought very odd, that a motion of so much importance should be entrusted to the most contemptible little piece of machinery in the whole kingdom. His honest zeal however was disappointed. The minister took fright, and at the very instant that little Ellis was going to open, sent him an order to sit down.”

Again, Vol. II. p. 239,—“Welbore Ellis, what say you? Is this the law of parliament, or is it not? I am a plain man, sir, and cannot follow you through the phlegmatic forms of an oration. Speak out Grildrig,—say yes, or no.”

Is this the language of one who was under personal obligations to his friend?

Junius had ceased writing under that signa-

ture when the name of Sir Philip Francis was mentioned by him. January 25, 1772, Junius informs Mr. Woodfall, "having nothing better to do, I propose to entertain myself and the public with torturing that Barrington." Three days afterwards, a severe invective against that nobleman followed, which was two months before the public were apprised of the dismissal of Sir Philip Francis; and after this dismissal we have a long account of Lord Barrington's life; an attentive perusal of which must convince every reader, that such a narrative proceeded from a very different quarter than from the pen of Sir Philip Francis.

Events are referred to which happened before Sir Philip Francis was born, but of which Junius had a thorough knowledge: he confesses "Lord Barrington and he were old acquaintance," and in taking "a short review of him from his political birth," comments on many subjects which could only have been known to one who moved in a very different circle to Sir Philip Francis. Lord Barrington had become unpopular in consequence of having discharged Sir Philip Francis from his office without just cause. He afterwards endeavoured to clear his character from Junius's imputations, and in furtherance of this measure he took an early opportunity of applying to Lord North on Sir Philip Francis' behalf,

when he found he had arrived in England from his tour. Lord North accordingly gave him an appointment in India. If Lord Barrington had had the most distant idea that Sir Philip Francis was in any way concerned in the authorship of the letters, would he thus generously have recommended him to the notice of Lord North?

The family of Sir Philip Francis lived on intimate terms with David Garrick, for whom they entertained the highest esteem. The tenor of the correspondence between Junius and Mr. Woodfall, proves that Junius had no regard for Mr. Garrick whatever.

There was nothing extraordinary in Sir Philip Francis taking a tour to France after his dismissal from the War Office, where he had been so closely confined to business. He had no other employment to attend to, and having never been in France before, it was a novelty. Whereas Junius, expressly states a circumstance which he saw with his own eyes, before Sir Philip was born, viz.—“The Jesuitical books burnt in Paris by the common hangman.”

Sir Philip Francis was an Irishman. It is proved by incontrovertible evidence that Junius was an Englishman.

Sir Philip Francis wrote to Sir Richard Phillips, stating, that it was a “*malignant falsehood*” to attribute the authorship of the letters

to him. What language could be stronger or more to the point? Upon the receipt of this communication, Sir Richard Phillips immediately abandoned any further enquiry, perceiving the theory was built on an erroneous supposition. It would have been well for the reputation of other literary critics, had they followed so wise an example.

To return from our digression: respecting Lord Barrington, Junius further adds—"those who know but little of his history may perhaps be inclined to pity him: *but he and I have been old acquaintance*, and, considering the size of his understanding, I believe I shall be able to prove that no man in the kingdom ever sold himself and his services to better advantage than Lord Barrington. Let us take a review of him from his political birth.

"On his entrance into the House of Commons he declared himself a patriot; but he soon found means to dispose of his patriotism for a seat at the Admiralty-board. This worthy man, before he obtained his price, was as deeply engaged in opposition to government, as any member of the Fountain Club, to which he belonged. He then thought it no sin to run down Sir Robert Walpole, though now he has altered his tone."—Miscel. Letter cxiii. 12 May, 1772.

Sir Robert Walpole, Lord George Sackville,

and Lord Barrington, were members of the House of Commons in the same session of parliament. A recollection of the political squabbles of that day induces Junius to exclaim in another letter—
 “ I remember the great Walpolean battles.”

Let us now proceed to the most striking object of Junius’s attack, the Marquis of Granby, who received the thanks of Prince Ferdinand, the thanks of the King, was promoted to the station of commander-in-chief, master-general of the ordnance, a member of the privy council, a governor of Christ’s Hospital, with other important places, *previously held by Lord George Sackville himself.*

In his first letter he says, “ It has *lately* been a fashion to pay a compliment to the *bravery* and generosity of the commander-in-chief, at the expense of his understanding.”

Would any one, I ask, who had no personal enmity against the Marquis, make use of so frivolous a pretext for introducing his name, and stating to the public what is totally contrary to sense and reason? This was so pointed that a gentleman under the signature of Titus, who endeavoured to exculpate his friend’s character, says—

“ It is true, his talents as *commander-in-chief* have never been tried in the field: but if we may be allowed to judge from the whole of his con-

duct in Germany during the late war, when the execution of many important enterprises were entrusted to him by one of the greatest generals, and one of the best judges of military merit in Europe, we may form great expectations with the highest probability of not being disappointed. *He knows how to obey: he knows that a good soldier never disputes the commands of his superior.*"

This evidently alludes to Lord George, whom he suspected was the author of the attack in question, and concludes an able letter by saying — "It matters not whether the malicious dart be pointed from *the closet of a disgraced soldier,*" &c.

Sir William Draper also suspected him, although he makes no personal allusions in his answers—but plainly calls upon him to follow his example by laying his name before the public. Junius knew better. He had a rod in reserve for so many others, that his object would have been frustrated. Sir William's answer only added fuel to the flame. Junius replies with all the jealousy a discarded officer would naturally feel at the recollection of the places he had formerly held, and which were now transferred to the Marquis.

"Without disputing Lord Granby's courage," says he, "we are yet to learn in what articles of military knowledge Nature has been so very li-

beral to his mind. *If you have served with him* [as much as to say *I have*], you ought to have pointed out some instance of able disposition and well concerted enterprise, which might fairly be attributed to his capacity as a general.—It is you, Sir William, who make your friend appear ridiculous, by giving him a laced suit of tawdry qualifications, which Nature never intended him to wear. You say he has acquired nothing but honour in the field. Is the ordnance nothing? Are the Blues nothing? Is the command of the army, with all the patronage annexed to it, nothing? Where he got these nothings, I know not: but you at least ought to have told us where he deserved them.”

Other personal allusions to the Marquis may be found on a careful perusal of Junius; for instance, “You may give us a commander-in-chief [the Marquis of Granby], and a secretary at war [Lord Barrington], seeming to pull at two ends of a rope: while a slip-knot in the middle, may really strangle three fourths of the army.”

Again, May 6, 1769:—

“TO THE MARQUIS OF GRANBY.

“You were once the favourite of the public. As a brave man you were admired by the army: as a generous man you were beloved. The scene is altered, and even your immediate dependants,

who have profited most by your good-nature, cannot conceal from you how much you have lost both in the affections of your *fellow-soldiers*, and the esteem of your country. Your character, once spotless, once irreproachable, has been drawn into a public question: attacked with severity, defended with imprudence, and, like the seat of war, ruined by the contention.”

Junius *here* admits the Marquis was once a brave man; but his bravery appears to have died away after the battle of Minden, where he distinguished himself more than at any other period. He had no opportunity afterwards of displaying his courage, the seat of war having been transferred to America; so that it was next to impossible that he could lose the confidence of the public or the affections of his fellow-soldiers. Out of the many private letters that were written in answer to Junius, not one appeared, but spoke well of him—had he lost the affections of his country, one anonymous writer might surely have been found to side with Junius. But no: the only fellow-soldier Junius speaks of, appears to have been himself.

Aug. 25, 1767.—Of Lord Townshend and his brother the hon. Charles Townshend, the former lord-lieutenant of Ireland, and the latter chancellor of the exchequer, Junius says,—“I am not a stranger to *this par nobile fratrum*. I have

served under the one, and have been forty times promised to be served by the other." This assertion comes closely home to some officer. Facts are stubborn things. Now I know it to be an undeniable fact that Lord George served *with* Lord Townshend at Dettingen *under* the Duke of Cumberland; Lord Granby was also present. An event occurred which was much talked of at the time. The occurrence was as follows.

“In the very heat of the carnage of that day, and amidst the horrors of almost universal desolation, a soldier fighting near Lord Townshend’s side, was killed by a cannon ball: part of his brains flew out; some on his Lordship’s clothes and in his face. The brave General G——, being near him, said ‘My Lord, this is terrible work to-day:’ ‘So it is,’ replied his Lordship, wiping himself with great calmness; ‘but one would imagine, General, this man had too much brains to be here;’ at the same time, tears of manly pity filled his compassionate eyes.”

Not content with reading this plain unvarnished anecdote in the paper afterwards, Junius takes occasion in Letter VI. 12 Oct. 1767, to comment upon it, in a satirical manner, wherein he intimates that Lord Townshend betrayed symptoms of cowardice. “Reader,” observes Junius, “remark this, and if you doubt of his Lordship’s humanity, you are infidel enough to


doubt of his courage. Well, he burst into tears: and who could choose but weep at a sentiment of such tender, compassionate and sympathizing humanity? No one that I know of can suppose those tears shed from that depression of spirits which the extremity of fear sometimes causes, and which finds some ease from an involuntary overflow at the eyes."

At the period when this was written, Lord Townshend had been promoted to the station of lieutenant-general of the ordnance, a situation formerly held by Lord George himself.


His appointment to the lord lieutenancy of Ireland, Junius considered equally reprehensible on the part of government, thinking him not qualified to fill that high station. There must have been some private offence given, to account for the manner in which Junius pursues him. This is a very important part of our enquiry. Soon after the unfortunate misunderstanding at Minden, Lord George Townshend (who had formerly been on friendly terms with Lord George Sackville, particularly at the battle of Dettingen) joined with the court party in publicly censuring his conduct. He had an ingenious turn for drawing, and he even went so far as to caricature Lord George flying from Minden, which with many others he privately circulated among his friends. This book of caricatures,



The Mistake near Minden in Germany 1759.



Who shewd his Rear at Minden 1759.



bearing date from 1756 to 1762, is extremely curious. As they were privately distributed, they are of course seldom to be met with. I never saw but one complete set, now in the possession of W. Little, esq. of Richmond, who has obligingly allowed me to copy the one in question, which is submitted to the reader's inspection. We have Lord Orford's testimony to prove that this book was the production of Lord George Townshend. Lord Orford has described the first of the series, Vol. II. p. 68, "A new species of this manufacture now first appeared, invented by Lord George Townshend; they were caricatures on cards. The original one, which had amazing vent, was of Newcastle and Fox, looking at each other, and crying, with Peachum in the Beggar's Opera, '*Brother, brother, we are both in the wrong.*' On the Royal Exchange a paper was affixed, advertising 'Three kingdoms to be let: enquire of Andrew Stone, broker, in Lincoln's Inn Fields.'"

The whole series forms a curious collection. Those on Lord George Sackville were very severe. In return for so gross a breach of decorum in triumphing over a fallen friend, Junius takes occasion to retaliate, by charging Lord Townshend with cowardice at the battle of Dettingen, and in the next letter points out a few public cha-

racters to his notice, as suitable subjects for his ingenuity.

Sept. 16, 1767, he says,—“ His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland is said to have a singular turn for portrait painting, which he willingly employs in the service of his friends. He performs gratis, and seldom gives them the trouble of sitting for their pictures. But I believe the talents of this ingenious nobleman never had so fair an occasion of being employed to advantage as at present. It happens very fortunately for him that he has now a set of friends, who seem intended by nature for the subjects of such a pencil. In delineating their features to the public, he will have an equal opportunity of displaying the delicacy of his hand, and, upon which he chiefly piques himself, the benevolence of his heart. But considering the importance of his present cares, I would fain endeavour to save him the labour of the design, in hopes that he will bestow a few moments more upon the execution. Yet I will not presume to claim the merit of invention. The blindness of chance has done more for the painter than the warmest fancy could have imagined, and has brought together such a group of figures, as I believe never appeared in real life or upon canvass before.

“ Your principal character, my Lord, is a young

duke [the Duke of Grafton] mounted upon a lofty phaëton, his head grows giddy, his horses carry him violently down a precipice, and a bloody carcase, the fatal emblem of Britannia, lies mangled under his wheels. By the side of this furious charioteer, sits Caution without Foresight [Mr. Conway], a motley thing, half military, scarce civil. He too would guide, but, let who will drive, is determined to have a seat in the carriage. If it be possible, my Lord, give him to us in the attitude of an orator eating the end of a period, which may begin with, *I did not say I would pledge my self*. The rest he eats. Your next figure must bear the port and habit of a judge [Lord Camden]; the laws of England under his feet, and before his distorted vision a dagger, which he calls the law of nature, and which marshalls him the way to the murder of the constitution. In such good company, the respectable president of the council [Lord Northington] cannot possibly be omitted: a reasonable number of decrees must be piled up behind him, with the word REVERSED in capital letters upon each of them, and out of his decent lips a compliment à la tilbury. * * * *

“There is still a young man, my Lord, who, I think, will make a capital figure in the piece: his features are too happily marked to be mistaken; a single line of his face will be sufficient

to give us the heir apparent of Loyola and all the College. A little more of the devil, my Lord, if you please, about the eye-brows: that's enough, a perfect Malagrida I protest [Lord Shelburne]. So much for his person: and, as for his mind, a blinking bull-dog placed near him, will form a very natural type of all his good qualities. These are the figures, which are to come forward to the front of the piece. Your friendship for the Earl of Bute will naturally secure a corner in the retirement for him and his curtain, provided you discover him * * * *.

“ If there be still any vacancies in the canvass, you will easily fill them up with fixtures or still life. You may show us half a paymaster, for instance [Lord North*], with a paper stuck upon the globe of his eye, and a label out of his mouth, *no sir, I am of t'other side, sir*. How I lament that sounds cannot be conveyed to the eye! You may give us a commander-in-chief [Marquis of Granby], and a secretary at war [Lord Barrington], seeming to pull at two ends of a rope; while a slip-knot in the middle may really strangle three fourths of the army: or a lunatic brandishing a crutch [Lord Chatham], or bawling through a grate, or writing with desperate char-

* Lord North and Sir G. Cooke were joint paymasters-general at this period. Lord North is the person alluded to.

coal a letter to North America ; or a Scotch secretary [Sir Gilbert Elliot], teaching the Irish people the true pronounciation of the Irish language. That barbarous people are but little accustomed to figures of oratory, so that you may represent him in any attitude you think proper, from that of Sir Gilbert Elliot down to Governor Johnstone. These however are but the slighter ornaments of composition, and so I leave them to the choice of your own luxurious fancy.

“The back-ground may be shadowed with the natural obscurity of Scotch clerks and Scotch secretaries, who may be itched out to the life, with one hand grasping a pen, the other riveted in their respective * * * * *. Your southern writers are apt to rub their foreheads in the agony of composition ; but with Scotchmen the seat of inspiration lies in a lower place, which, while the *furor* is upon them they lacerate without mercy.

“But amidst all the license of your wit, my Lord, I must entreat you to remember that there is one character too high and too sacred even for the pencil of a peer, though your Lordship *has formerly done business for the family*. Besides, the attempt would be unnecessary. The true character of that great person* is engraven

* Junius here alludes to his father Lionel, Duke of Dorset, who was several years lord lieutenant of Ireland. No one can walk up and down that fine street, Sackville street, without

on the hearts of the Irish nation : and as to a false one, they need only take a survey of the person and manners of their chief governor, if in the midst of their distresses they can laugh at the perfect caricature of a king.

“ CORREGIO.”

This letter gave such great offence to the parties, that they made every investigation to discover the author. Suspicions ultimately fell on Lord George Sackville, though there was no possible means of ascertaining the fact to a certainty. A consultation was held and a satirical dialogue was drawn up taxing him with it; and if we substitute the character of Lord George Sackville for that of Lord Shelburne, the passages will bear out this conjecture.

Letter VII., 22 Oct., 1767, terminates as follows :

“ Malagrida [Lord George Sackville]. Won't you hear me my lord ?

“ Sulky [Lord Townshend]. It is unnecessary, my dear Lord. I see your meaning written in your face. (*Aside*) What the devil shall I do now ? A sick man might as well be cured by a consultation of quack doctors ; they talk, and debate, and wrangle, and the patient expires. However, I shall at least have the satisfaction of being reminded of the duke's popular administration in that country. Lord George was his secretary.

drawing their pictures. I believe the best thing I can do, will be to consult with my Lord George Sackville. His character is known and respected in Ireland as much as it is here, and I know he loves to be stationed in the *rear* as well as myself."—*Exit*.

“Malagrida [Lord George], *solus* (The others are represented as having gone out one by one, after making their remarks). What a negro’s skin must I have, if this shallow fellow could see my meaning in my face! Now will I skulk away to —, where I will betray or misrepresent every syllable I have heard, ridicule their persons, blacken their characters, and fawn upon the man who hears me, until I have an opportunity of biting him even to the heart.”—*Exit*.

Lord George Sackville, being a Privy Counsellor, was suspected of having satirized and exposed the affairs of government, as well as the members of administration; but it was a question of too delicate a nature, to charge him direct with having betrayed the trust confided in him. The parties, therefore, took this opportunity of letting him know, by the lampoon from which the above quotation is taken, that they had grounds for their suspicions, and Mr. Woodfall has, I think, been mistaken in his conjecture, that this is a production of the pen of Junius; though it requires but little foresight to detect the error. The tenor of the dialogue is to show,

that no business could be transacted while a Malagrida was among them. Therefore, to read it as the production of Junius's pen would be improper. I have every reason to believe Mr. Butler is of the same opinion. Allusions are made to some remarks of Junius in prior letters—such as, a provision for those sweet blooded children, the Scotch—the lord lieutenant's talent for portrait painting—the charge against him of cowardice at Dettingen—and the barbarity of the Irish; all which circumstances had been previously mentioned by Junius. The dialogue in question was shortly after attributed to Burke, who never disclaimed it.

Taking it in another point of view, we must be certain that it could not proceed from the pen of Junius, as Junius in his private letter to Mr. Woodfall was very angry that Swinney should presume to call on Lord George, taxing him with writing the letters. Had he not been friendly to Lord George, he would not have been so anxious that he should escape suspicion. In proof of this assertion we do not find his name mentioned elsewhere, or any other allusion to him in the letters; whereas, had Junius been an enemy to Lord George, it is not likely his character would have been spared, especially as there are so many allusions to officers about that time, whose conduct appeared to him highly reprehensible.

We now proceed to explain the causes of his animosity to the Duke of Bedford.

A few weeks after the battle of Minden, before Lord George had time to defend his conduct, the Duke of Bedford was appointed lord-lieutenant of Ireland, and *deputy ranger of the Phoenix Park, Dublin, in the room of Lord George Sackville.*

Here lies the mystery of Junius's antipathy and resentment. He writes down this nobleman without mercy: tells him what an honourable character he has sullied by leaving his own country; how unpopular he was in Ireland; states his unfortunate embassy to Versailles; and that he is the last man government ought to have trusted.

Letter xxiii. 19 Sept. 1769, concludes thus:—

“Your friends will ask, perhaps, whither shall this unhappy old man retire? Can he remain in the metropolis, where his life has been so often threatened, and his palace so often attacked? If he returns to Woburn, scorn and mockery await him. He must create a solitude round his estate, if he would avoid the face of reproach and derision. At Plymouth, his destruction would be more than probable; at Exeter, inevitable. No honest Englishman will ever forget his attachment, nor any honest Scotchman forgive his treachery to Lord Bute. At every town

he enters, he must change his liveries and his name. Whichever way he flies, the hue and cry of the country pursues him.

“In another kingdom, indeed, the blessings of his administration have been more severely felt: his virtues better understood: or, at worst, they will not for him alone, forget their hospitality. As well might Verres have returned to Sicily. You have twice escaped, my Lord; beware of a third experiment. The indignation of a whole people, plundered, insulted, and oppressed as they have been, will not always be disappointed. It is in vain therefore to shift the scene. You can no more fly from your enemies, than from yourself. Persecuted abroad, you look into your own heart for consolation, and find nothing but reproaches and despair. But, my Lord, you may quit the field of business, though not the field of danger; and though you cannot be safe, you may cease to be ridiculous. I fear you have listened too long to the advice of those pernicious friends, with whose interests you have sordidly united your own, and for whom you have sacrificed every thing that ought to be dear to a man of honour. They are still base enough to encourage the follies of your age, as they once did the vices of your youth. As little acquainted with the rules of decorum, as with the laws of morality, they will not suffer you to profit by experience, nor even to consult the propriety of a bad character. Even now

they tell you, that life is no more than a dramatic scene, in which the hero should preserve his consistency to the last, and that as you lived without virtue, you should die without repentance.”

Lord George considered it unmanly, ungentlemanly, and dishonourable in the duke, to accept of an appointment as deputy ranger of the Phoenix Park, until his conduct in Germany had been fairly tried and defended: whereas the duke took possession of the emolument arising from it, *sans ceremonie*.

Junius must have been more than a common political enemy to the duke, or he would not have taken such infinite pains to collect a catalogue of the various indignities that had been offered to him: he writes to his printer more than once, to obtain for him the information, when the duke was flogged by Humphrey:—not satisfied with this, he relates anecdotes of the duchess, which might easily have been obtained from Lord Chesterfield, with whom Lord George was on intimate terms. Another anecdote respecting the duke’s chastisement evidently came from that quarter. “Mr. Heston Humphrey, a country attorney, horsewhipped the duke with equal justice, severity, and perseverance, on the course at Litchfield. Rigby and lord Trentham* ”

* Characters well known to Lord George. See Lord Orford’s Memoirs.

were also cudgelled in a most exemplary manner. This gave rise to the following story: ‘When the late King heard that Sir Edward Hawke had given the French a drubbing, his Majesty, who had never received that kind of chastisement, was pleased to ask Lord Chesterfield the meaning of the word. ‘Sir,’ says Lord Chesterfield, ‘the meaning of the word—but here comes the Duke of Bedford, who is better able to explain it to your Majesty than I am.’”

In confirmation that Lord George and Lord Chesterfield were personally acquainted, we need only refer to Mr. Stockdale’s Memoirs, who relates the following anecdote.

“One day when I dined with Lord George at Chatham, an officer who was in company asked him what he thought of Lord Tyrawley as a *bel esprit*? ‘The first time,’ replied he, ‘that I heard him converse, I thought him very interesting; the second time, very well; and the third time very indifferent. *That is not the way,*’ added he, ‘*with my Lord Chesterfield; he never flags.*”

The allusion which Junius makes to Verres, contrasted with the Duke of Bedford; “as well might Verres have returned to Sicily,” reminds us of Swift’s satirical description of the Duke of Wharton’s lord lieutenancy under that character.

In the Gentleman's Magazine for September 1785, is the following paragraph, which is in accordance with the expression of Junius.

“The late Lord Sackville, who was a man of extraordinary talents, wrote a beautiful eulogy on the late Princess of Orange, but which never graced the press. The genius, learning, and exalted virtues of the Princess, were the theme of his Lordship's *all-powerful pen*.”

“The above noble Lord, and his illustrious relation Lady Betty Germain, had the art of painting in words to a very eminent degree, and which afforded the finest ornaments in either poetry, history, or elocution. The very animated and beautiful imagery of Cicero, in which he paints the cruelty of Verres, is spoken of with rapture by her Ladyship in some of her letters to Dean Swift. It was in a letter to the above lady that Dean Swift styled Ireland the Isle of Saints.”

The Graftons next claim our attention. His hatred to this family continued unabated to the last. He considered the minister's brother, Lieutenant-colonel Fitzroy, as the primary cause of all his disgrace, and that the family had conspired against him for personal emolument. No epithet, no satire, no words, can express his utter abhorrence of this family. They are all stamped with ignominy.

“There are some hereditary strokes of character,” says Junius, “by which a family may be as

clearly distinguished as by the blackest features of the human face.”

But it was the prime minister on whom Junius fastened like a vulture.

“If there be not a fatality attending every measure you are concerned in, by what treachery or by what excess of folly has it happened, that those ungracious acts, which have distinguished your administration, and which I doubt not were entirely your own, should carry with them a strong appearance *of personal interest and even of personal enmity, in a quarter where no such interest or enmity can be supposed to exist, without the highest injustice and the highest dishonour?*”

—Letter VIII., 18 March, 1769.

“If I were personally your enemy, I might pity and forgive you. You have every claim to compassion, that can arise from misery and distress; the condition you are reduced to, would disarm a private enemy of his resentment, and leave no consolation to the most vindictive spirit, but that such an object as you are, would disgrace the dignity of revenge. But in the relation you have borne to this country, you have no title to indulgence; *and if I had followed the dictates of my own opinion, I never should have allowed you the respite of a moment.* In your public character, you have injured every subject of the empire; and though an individual is not authorized to forgive the injuries done to so-

ciety, he is called upon to assert his separate share in the public resentment. *I submitted however to the judgement of men, more moderate, perhaps more candid than myself. For my own part, I do not pretend to understand those prudent forms of decorum, those gentle rules of discretion, which some men endeavour to unite with the conduct of the greatest and most hazardous affairs.*"

—Letter xxxvi., 14 Feb., 1770.

The former part of this personal remark alludes to the erasure of his name from the Privy Council list, which the Duke, in conjunction with Lord Chatham, advised the king immediately to enforce. The latter, to the disposal of his troops at Minden, where he considered his judgement equal to that of Prince Ferdinand, and which opinion he maintained on his trial.

Lord Chatham next claims our attention. This nobleman had attained the zenith of his power at the time of Lord George's trial, and sided with the King and Prince Ferdinand in contributing to his disgrace. His influence at Court continued, and although it may be matter of opinion at the present day, whether he used it impartially or not—it is evident that Junius watched him with a jealous eye, and freely commented on his public conduct.

“The same measures, by which an abandoned profligate is advanced to power, must be observed

to maintain him in it. The principal nobility, who might disdain to submit to the upstart insolence of a dictator, *must be removed from every post of honour and authority*; all public employments must be filled with a despicable set of creatures, who having neither experience nor capacity, nor any weight or respect in their own persons, will necessarily derive all their little busy importance from him.”—Miscel. Letter I., 28 April, 1767.

To the Earl of Chatham, Junius attributed the great increase of the national debt, which he predicted the country would never be able to repay.

“Your correspondent of yesterday, in his account of the new ministerial arrangements, has thrust in a laboured bombast panegyric on the Earl of Chatham: in which he tells us, that this country owes more to him than it can ever repay. Now Mr. Woodfall, I entirely agree with Mr. Macaroni, that this country *does* owe more to Lord Chatham than it can ever repay: for to *him* we owe the greatest part of our national debt; and *that* I am sure we never can repay.”—Letter XI., 22 Dec., 1767.

His introducing the Duke of Grafton into administration, his opposition to Mr. Grenville, (whose principles Lord George greatly admired), his decided opposition to the American Stamp Act, his advice to the king respecting the erasure

of his name from the Privy Council list, and the comments he made when Lord George appeared at court on the accession of George the Third, all combined, tended more than to counter-balance the favourable opinion which Junius entertained of his abilities as a senator, and well wisher to his country. Nor was it until he made so able a speech *against* the judgement of Lord Mansfield on Woodfall's trial, for publishing Junius's Letter to the King, that he had the candour to reverse his opinion of him.

The next on our list is Henry Frederick, Duke of Cumberland, a younger brother of George the Third, who appears to have come under the notice of Junius in consequence of his marriage into the Luttrell family, and who may be supposed to have sided with the Court party, which at this period was known to be obnoxious to Lord George Sackville.

TO HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE DUKE OF
CUMBERLAND.

“ SIR,

“ I BEG your royal Highness's acceptance of my sincere compliments of congratulation upon your auspicious union with the daughter of Lord Irnham, and the sister of Colonel Luttrell. For the present you will have so few of these compliments paid you, that mine perhaps may be

thought worthy your attention. I do assure your highness, with great sincerity, that, when I consider the various excellencies which adorn or constitute your personal character,—your natural parts—your affable, benevolent, generous temper—your good sense, so singularly improved by experience—and, above all the rest, the uncommon education which your venerable mother took care to give you,—I do not think it possible to have found a more suitable match for you than that which you have so discreetly provided for yourself. What you have done, will, I am sure, be no disgrace to yourself nor to any of your relations. Yet I must confess, partial as I am to you for the sake of that good prince, of whose resemblance you carry some cutting traces about you, I could wish you did not stand quite so near as you do, to the regency and crown of England.—God forbid I should ever hear your royal nephews say, as Edward the Fifth does in the play, *But why to the Tower, uncle ! Or why should you lock us up, aunt !* I mean, their uncle Luttrell and aunt Horton.

“ But, my good youth, let no considerations of this sort interrupt your pleasures. Your amiable spouse is as much Duchess of Cumberland, as our gracious queen, is Queen of Great Britain ; and of course she is the second woman in the kingdom. Your *papa* Irnham must at

least take rank of Lord Mansfield ; your brother Henry, of the Princes of Mecklenburgh, and your sister Miss Luttrell, of Madam Swellemburgh. As to the king's not acknowledging the duchess, or forbidding her the Court, it signifies nothing. Her marriage is good in law, and her children will be legitimate. She may order plays, keep a court of her own, and set the Princess Dowager at defiance. But you need have no fear of being ill used. Your brother Harry [Luttrell] has a dagger at the throat of a certain person, and swears he will let the cat out of the bag about the Middlesex election. So far from offending Harry, I should not wonder to see him aid-de-camp to the King, and in a little time *commander-in-chief*."—Letter cii., 13 Nov. 1771.

The subject of the Duke of Cumberland's marriage could not possibly interest any political writer who had not some personal pique, either against the duke, or Colonel Luttrell's family. Lord George's animosity extended to both. It is well known that Lord Bute, who had espoused Prince Ferdinand's cause, had also exerted great influence over the Princess Dowager and her family, and who had been induced through that influence so far to slight Lord George, as to forbid his appearance at Court ; and we have the authority of the debates in the House of

Commons to prove the contempt Lord George entertained for the name of Luttrell. His animosity was carried to so great a height during "the debate on Mr. Vyner's motion for an enquiry into the Convention of Saratoga," that a duel had well nigh taken place between the parties. The particulars are too important and too closely connected with our enquiry to be passed over in silence.

In the course of the debate,—

"Mr. Temple Luttrell drew a comparison between the conduct of the officer and his minister. 'In former times,' he said, 'it had been the custom of Britons to give praise and thanks to such of their officers and servants as exerted their strenuous and zealous efforts for the public weal, even if those efforts were not crowned with success: but now-a-days they bestowed praise only in proportion to the listlessness and inattention with which those servants performed their duty. The noble lord, said he, in the blue riband [Lord North], disclaims being dictator whenever the mismanagement of government comes under the consideration of parliament. Whether Great Britain is prosperous or defeated, it is none of his plan, none of his act. In every thing essential to the greatness or happiness of the nation, we find the noble lord timid: he is not the first minister, he is only the instrument of the Privy Council: he has but

one humble vote there, and cannot be accountable to the nation for the folly of the plans he undertakes to recommend to his sovereign. And should the plan strike at the liberties of the country, at the very root of the constitution, he is then but the echo of parliament. In what is the noble lord daring and enterprising? He prides himself but on one act founded on his own resolutions, judgement, and integrity; he asks credit in parliament but for one ornament added to the crown, one benefit to the state: that act of his own, consists in having fixed on a crisis of impending ruin and calamity unknown in the annals of our history before, and which the firm spirit and exalted wisdom of a Chatham might have found difficult to cope with; then did he seize the glorious opportunity to recommend to his sovereign a war minister [Lord George Germain] whose public incapacities for every vigorous exertion of mind, whose disgrace at the Court of George the Second was founded on the most decisive censure of a court-martial; whose loss of the nation's confidence and his own character, is on public record. What had the nation to expect from his councils? What plan of his, since in his office, dare he expose to the public eye, and say it has succeeded? Why then should we give him a partial acquittal to the prejudice of a gallant officer

[General Burgoyne], whose only crime has been avowedly that he was too zealous, too brave, too enterprising, too anxious for the good of his country; had strictly obeyed his orders; and done all that British valour was capable of, to carry the minister's plan into execution. Had he, instead of that, receded from his colours, disobeyed the commands of his superiors, and hid himself from danger, he might have had pretensions to one noble lord's patronage [Lord North], and to the other's [Lord George Germain] dignities and emoluments. General Burgoyne asks a fair and open trial; the man who shrinks from it and avails himself of an unjust partial acquittal, must be guilty.

“ Lord George Germain said, ‘ that he never was personal in the House to any one; never by any conduct of his, merited such an attack; *he despised that honourable member, but would level himself with his wretched character and malice; old as he was, he would meet that fighting gentleman and be revenged.*’

“ (Here he was interrupted by a cry of order in the House, and general confusion.)

“ The Speaker said, if the House would support him, he would keep order (a cry of Chair, chair!)

“ Lord North admitted, that Lord George Germain had been out of order; what fell from

him had nothing to do with the question. It was a personal attack on an individual, and therefore out of order.

“ Mr. Luttrell said he would not be bullied out of the privilege of a member of that House ; he had a right to speak his sentiments publicly and fully on a public character. The sentence of the court-martial in the reign of George the Second was a public record, relative to a man in a public post of trust, which required spirit, zeal, abilities and integrity, and many essential qualities as requisite in a war minister as in a general. He had not alluded to the noble lord’s private vices or virtues, and if he could be conceived out of order as to the question, it could not imply that public charge of the minister was a *private personality*.”

Mr. Luttrell took an opportunity in the confusion of debate to get out of the House, to avoid being compelled not to resent Lord George Germain’s personal abuse of him ; but the Speaker gave orders to the Sergeant at Arms to stop Mr. Luttrell and bring him to his seat.

“ The Speaker then said, that words of heat having dropped from two honourable members in the course of the debate, he must require them to stand up in their places and give the House an assurance that the matter should go no further.

“ Lord George Germain said, if any words

had been used by him that were improper to be said in the House, he was sorry for it, and hoped the House would excuse it. He acknowledged he was out of order.

“ Mr. Luttrell was then called upon.—He said, ‘ if after being insulted for doing his duty, he was to be committed for delivering the sentence of George the Second, he should prefer being committed, to giving up the privilege of parliament and promising to take no notice of a personal attack—not founded upon public opinion, upon any motive, upon any trial—and hearing epithets made use of against him which were almost as personal as they appeared: he should give no other answer, and abide by the decision of the House.’ ” Several members rose, and a dispute ensued, whether Lord George had made sufficient apologies or not, and a motion was made about eleven o’clock by Mr. Butler—

“ ‘ That the Hon. Temple Luttrell, be immediately taken into the custody of the serjeant-at-arms.’ ”

Disputes continued till past twelve, in which Sir James Lowther, Sir G. Yonge, Mr. Howard, and others were of opinion that the privilege of parliament would suffer, if Mr. Luttrell were committed upon the present facts before the House, and drew a distinction between public and private charges.

Mr. Butler, Mr. Onslow, and many members on that side, thought Lord George could not in honour make further apologies, and were therefore for committing Mr. Luttrell.

“ Mr. Luttrell stood up and said, ‘ that being again informed by the oldest members of parliament from every quarter of the House, that no public business whatever could go on till this altercation was settled, and being resolved to abide at all events by his privilege of parliament, he should beg leave to second the motion for his immediate commitment ; that by his absence the house might proceed on a question of great importance to every military man and to the whole nation : and that as parliament had but a few days more to sit before its prorogation, and still more weighty affairs of state remained for their discussion, it was necessary to discharge this dispute : he would make no apology for public severity of language, but an apology he must seek for personal insult to himself.’ Upon this, Mr. Luttrell was, between twelve and one o’clock in the morning going to be taken into the custody of the serjeant-at-arms, when

“ Lord George Germain rose to make a second reply, which was fairly and particularly addressed to the honorable gentleman for certain improper words which the noble lord had addressed to him

in the warmth of debate, and from feeling himself hurt by the charges stated against him.

“Mr. Luttrell then said, that ‘now the House was satisfied that sufficient apology was made for the personality they had heard spoken against him, he should out of respect to the House comply with their injunctions that it should go no further : and begged leave once more to observe that, what was said by him of the noble lord was meant as public matter, not as private abuse or enmity.’”—Here the affair ended.

However ill timed, out of place, or unsuitable to the debate in question, Mr. Luttrell’s remarks on the conduct of Lord George might have been ; the latter evidently betrayed an unwarrantable warmth of temper in his reply. The animosity that subsisted between them may account for the feelings of Lord George having been so wrought upon, as to induce him to make use of expressions, highly indignant and reprehensible. His private character, although adorned with many valuable qualifications, was known to possess this failing.

And here we can but notice the same individual enmity which is peculiar to Junius when he has been offended.

In his private letter to Mr. Woodfall, he says “That Swinney, is a *wretched*, but a dangerous

fool." In the instance before us, Lord George publicly remarked, "that he despised that honourable member; but would level himself with his *wretched* character and malice."

This involuntary instance of disdain, hauteur, and contempt towards a member of the House of Commons, while it betrays the weakness of human nature, tends to depicture a certain characteristic which prevails throughout Junius:—nor is it possible to contrast the two expressions without being forcibly struck with the truth of this observation.

We may also observe that the same spirit displayed by Junius against General Burgoyne (Letter xxxiv., 12th Dec. 1769), is exemplified in the case before us, where Mr. Temple Luttrell warmly espouses his cause, and Lord George as warmly refers it to a court-martial. But in the case of Sir Jeffery Amherst who was placed in a similar situation to General Burgoyne some years before; Junius employs many pages of his eloquence in censuring ministers and protecting his friend, in which he was ultimately successful. Ministers became tired of his frequent appeals to the public, and although they had deprived Sir Jeffery of his command in America in the first instance, they were ultimately obliged to concede to his terms, as Junius had foretold.

In Miscellaneous Letter, XLIV., 20th Sept. 1768, he observes,—

“When you, my Lord [Hillsborough], and Mr. Ford are forgotten, this country will remember with gratitude, that Sir Jeffery Amherst had the honour of making sixteen French battalions prisoners of war; that he carried on the whole war in America at an expense less than the fortunes which some individuals had acquired by contracts and management in Germany: and that he *did not* put the savings into his own pocket.

“Here I shall conclude. You have sent Sir Jeffery Amherst to the plough. You have left him poor in every article of which a false fawning minister could deprive him; but you have left him rich in the esteem, the love, and veneration of his country. You cannot *now* recal him by any offer of wealth or honours. Yet I foretel that a time will come, when you yourself will be the cause of his return. Proceed, my Lord, as you have begun, and you will soon reduce this country to an extremity, in which the wisest and best subjects *must* be called upon, and *must* be employed. Till then enjoy your triumph.”

Now it is well known that Lord Amherst and Lord George Sackville had always lived on the most intimate terms from childhood. Sir Jeffery was born within a mile of Knowle Park, Lord George's paternal residence, and it was to Lionel,

Duke of Dorset, that he owed his first appointment in the army. At the time when the Duke of Dorset was lord lieutenant of Ireland and his son, Lord George Sackville was his Secretary, Sir Jeffery Amherst formed part of the household; which circumstance was mentioned by Lord George to the King on the occasion of his being created a Viscount. Sir Jeffery was a constant visitor at his Lordship's town residence in Pall-Mall: and was consulted by him on all occasions.

When Lord George became secretary of state for the American colonies, Sir Jeffery Amherst was made a member of the cabinet: and through Lord George's influence, he was also appointed commander-in-chief of his majesty's forces, and created a Baron.

The same enthusiasm is displayed by Junius when speaking of Mr. Grenville, as of his friend Sir Jeffery Amherst.

Miscellaneous Letter x., 19 December, 1767, on the subject of the American colonies, Junius says—

“There was indeed one man, [George Grenville,] who wisely foresaw every circumstance which has since happened, and who, with a patriot's spirit, opposed himself to the torrent. He told us, that, if we thought the loss of outstanding debts, and of our American trade, a mischief of the first magnitude, such an injudi-

cious compliance with the terms dictated by the colonies, was the way to make it sure and unavoidable. It was *ne moriari mori*. We see the prophecy verified in every particular, and if *this great and good man* was mistaken in any one instance, it was, perhaps, that he did not expect his predictions to be fulfilled so soon as they have been."

Again—15 Dec. 1768—To the right honourable George Grenville—concludes with this fine eulogium on his character:—

"Your weight and authority in parliament, are acknowledged by the submission of your opponents. Your credit with the public is equally extensive and secure, because it is founded on a system of conduct wisely adopted and firmly maintained. You have invariably adhered to one cause, one language, and when your friends deserted that cause, they deserted you. They who dispute the rectitude of your opinions, admit that your conduct has been uniform, manly, and consistent. While Parliament preserves its constitutional authority, you will preserve yours. As long as there is a real representation of the people, you will be heard in that great assembly with attention, deference, and respect; and if fatally for England, the designs of the present ministry should at last succeed, you will have the consolation to reflect that your voice was heard, until the voice of truth and reason was

drowned in the din of arms; and that your influence in parliament was irresistible, until every question was decided by the sword."

The same admiration of his talents as a statesman, and his character as an individual, was publicly expressed by Lord George in the House of Commons, the 25th Feb. 1774; on a motion for making the "Grenville Act" perpetual—he said, "The author of this bill, Mr. Grenville, had preserved a good name while in office, and when out: and he sincerely hoped, the noble Lord would endeavour, *to have his name handed down to posterity with the same honour as Mr. Grenville had.*"

He coincided with Mr. Grenville in the house, on several other occasions, particularly by his strenuous support of the *Stamp Act*, which will be mentioned in its proper place.

In 1757, an administration was attempted to be formed, including Lord G. Sackville as secretary at war, and George Grenville, as Chancellor of the Exchequer; this was, however, abandoned. From that period down to the time of Junius, although they continued members in successive parliaments, and coincided in every respect in politics, yet I have never been able to find that they were on terms of personal acquaintance, which accords with the expression of Junius in Letter xviii, 27 July, 1769: "I have not the honour of being personally known to him." But it

is evident by Lord George's eulogium on his character after his decease, that he continued a warm admirer of his talents as a statesman.

The reader is particularly referred to a most interesting work, entitled "Memoirs of the last ten years of the reign of George the Second, by Horace Walpole, earl of Orford," which fully proves Lord George's personal knowledge of Lord Hertford, Sir Edward Hawke, Lord Gower, Mr. Rigby, Peg Trentham, George Selwyn, the Princess Dowager, Mannikin Ellis, Mr. Conway, Mr. Calcraft, the Duchess of Bedford, the Earl of Dunbar, brother to Lord Mansfield, Sir James Lowther, Mr. Legge, Lord Egremont, and Lord Eglintoun, who are slightly alluded to by Junius. It is unnecessary to particularize them here. I shall conclude this preliminary detail, by extracting such parts of the work as more particularly refer to Lord George's *political* conduct in early life, and his subsequent disgrace at court, which still further elucidate the causes of his animosity against the King, the Duke of Bedford, Lord Mansfield, the Earl of Chatham, the Duke of Cumberland, Lord Bute, and other branches of the ministry so personally alluded to by Junius.

Feb. 1751, Lord George opposes the Duke of Cumberland's Mutiny Bill, in conjunction with Mr. Fox and Colonel Henry Seymour Conway, brother to Lord Hertford: with whom he quar-

relled afterwards : both Conway and Hertford fall under a share of Junius's satire.—The former in Miscellaneous Letter v. 16 Sept. 1767, is styled “Caution without Foresight, a motley thing, half military, scarce civil”; of the latter, Letter LXIX. he says, “the indigent circumstances of Lord Hertford's family account for and justify their conduct,” &c.

24 April 1751, Vol. I. p. 91.—In the case of General Anstruther, Lord George Sackville said, “The officers were concerned to have this affair enquired into ; that if the general did not disculpate himself, could officers with honour serve under him ? that he was sensible of the difficulty of not being able to punish him ; and therefore would give his negative to calling in Ofarel, but proposed to have Anstruther tried by a board of general officers.” His severity in this instance, as well as towards general Burgoyne, and the affair at Rochfort, gained him many enemies.

In 1752, Vol. I. p. 244, factions prevailed in Ireland, wherein Lord George forms a conspicuous figure.

Lord Harrington was succeeded in the Lord-Lieutenancy, by “Lionel, Duke of Dorset, who was a man of caution, dignity and plausibility, and who had formerly ruled Ireland to their universal satisfaction. But he then acted from himself ; he was now in the hands of two men most

unlike himself, his youngest son, Lord George Sackville, and Dr. George Stone, the primate of Ireland. The former, a man, *of very sound parts, of distinguished bravery*, and of as honourable eloquence, but hot, haughty, ambitious and obstinate. The primate, a man of fair appearance, if not inferior parts, more insinuating, but by no means less ambitious, had with no pretensions in the world, but by being attached to the house of Dorset, and by being brother of Mr. Stone, been hurried through two or three Irish bishopricks up to the very primacy of the kingdom, not only unwarrantably young, but without even the graver excuses of learning or sanctimony. Instead of attempting to conciliate the affections of a nation offended at his promotion, he thought of nothing but governing by the same influence by which he had been raised. Lord George, as little disposed to be controuled, would not stoop to the usual management for Mr. Boyle: and he was not likely to be persuaded to observe any attentions by the primate, who had shaken them off himself. The speaker who had not lost his taste for power, by being accustomed to it, was soon alarmed, and had an opportunity of revenge offered to him almost as soon as the offence.

“ Lord George’s measures were apt to be abrupt: he directly offered the Speaker a peerage,

and a pension of 1500*l.* a year. The Speaker replied, ‘ If I had a peerage, I should not think myself greater than now that I am Mr. Boyle : for t’other thing, I despise it as much as the person who offers it.’ This, and some indirect threats equally miscarrying, and the Castle finding that their creature Jones must be the first victim, endeavoured to defer what they could not prevent. The Speaker’s party moved for a call of the house for that day three weeks ; Lord George Sackville moved to have it that day six weeks—and was beaten ! Whoever has seen the tide first turn in favour of an opposition, may judge of the riotous triumphs occasioned by this victory. The ladies made balls, the mob bonfires, the poets pasquinades. The address that was soon after sent over to the King, applied directly to Lord George, and not as was usual to the Lord Lieutenant ; and they told his majesty, in plain terms, that it was from apprehension of being misrepresented.”

This circumstance may fairly account for that satirical passage in Junius’s *Miscellaneous Letter v.* 15 Sept. 1767, where he ridicules “ a Scotch Secretary teaching the Irish people the true pronunciation of the English language. That barbarous people are but little accustomed to figures of oratory.”

Dec. 1753, Vol. i. p. 319. The heats in Ireland increased with the success of the opposition.

The Speaker was adored by the mob ; they worshipped him under the name of *Roger*. They made bonfires of reproach before the door of the primate ; they stopped coaches, and made them declare for England or Ireland. The hackney chairmen distinguished their patriotism by refusing to carry any fare to the Castle. A Dr. Andrews of the Castle faction, reproaching a Mr. Lambert at the door of the House of Commons, with forfeiting a promise of bringing him into parliament, and proceeding to a challenge, Lambert said, ‘ I will first go into the house and vote against that rascal Neville Jones.’ Dr. Andrews repeating the insult, Lambert went in and complained, and Andrews was ordered into custody ; Carter, Master of the Rolls, saying, ‘ What ! would that man force himself into a seat here ! And for what ? Only to prostitute his vote to a man [Lord George Sackville] the known enemy of this country ! ’ ”

It was in allusion to this era, that a political writer in *Miscellaneous Letter* VII. 22 Oct. 1767 (erroneously attributed to Junius), says—

“ I believe the best thing I can do will be to consult with my Lord George Sackville. His character is known and respected in Ireland as much as it is here.”

March 1754, Vol. i. p. 338, Lord Orford continues :

“ The castle wore so little a spirit of pacifica-

tion, that the Duke of Dorset wrote to press the disgrace of the Speaker : but the English ministry would have conjured down the storm by pressing the Earl of Hertford to go lord deputy, when the Duke of Dorset should return, which would have avoided the ungracious removal of the primate's share in the regency. But this was a most unwelcome measure, not to that prelate only ; Lord George Sackville foresaw that Mr. Conway, a kind of cotemporary rival, and brother of Lord Hertford, would necessarily share the popular merit of restoring tranquillity ; and accordingly, as was supposed, instigated the Irish chancellor to write to England, that, if he was to carry the seals before Lord Hertford, he should desire to come to England during that period. Not content with this, the Duke himself wrote to prevent having Lord Hertford for deputy."

I have already mentioned in what manner Junius speaks of Mr. Conway and Lord Hertford, which the reader must observe will equally apply in the instance before us.

Feb. 1755, Vol. I. p. 374. "The Chancellor and Newcastle acquainted the Duke of Dorset that he was to return no more to Ireland. He bore the notification ill, and produced a letter from the primate, which announced a calmer posture of affairs, and mentioned a meeting of the opposition, at which no offensive healths had been

suffered. Lord George Sackville, who was present, had more command of himself, and owned that one temperate meeting did not afford sufficient grounds to say that animosities were composed; and he agreed to the prudential measure of their not going over again."

This result was strictly adhered to: the family never went over afterwards. The Duke retired with a pension of 3000*l.* a year, added to his wardenship of the Cinque Ports. Lord George Sackville retained the sinecure in Ireland, of Deputy Ranger of the Phoenix Park, which was afterwards taken from him, with many other emoluments, and given to the Duke of Bedford, with whom the family were on bad terms. See vol. II. 415.

1755, Vol. I. p. 489. Lord Orford, on a retrospection of the parliamentary orators of that day, observes, "Lord George Sackville informed and convinced; he spoke, because he knew that others misled, or were misled; with a frankness in his speech, there was a mystery in his conduct. which was far from inviting."

1756, Vol. II. p. 57. "In the Antelope, a little cargo of courage, as it was called, were sent at the same time Lord Tyrawley and Lord Panmure, to supersede General Fowke, and take the government of Gibraltar."

Lord George was friendly to General Fowke;

who was afterwards tried by a court martial; p. 69, and broken by the king. In allusion to this circumstance, Junius says, in Miscellaneous Letter cvii. 17 Feb. 1772, to Lord Barrington (sixteen years after the event took place)—
 “ *After ruining that brave and worthy man, General Fowke, under the auspices of the Duke of Newcastle, who saved you from destruction, you deserted to Mr. Pitt, the moment he came into power.*”

Lord George's friendship for General Fowke drew him into a squabble with Lord Tyrawley afterwards, whom he roundly censured for extravagance on his station, in dissipating the public money.

1758, Vol. II. p. 290. “ Lord George Sackville was now rising to a principal figure. His abilities in the House of Commons, and his interest with Pitt gave him great weight in government; and every thing seemed to promise him the first rank in the army, where, since the depression of Conway, he stood without a rival. The Duke [of Cumberland] who hated him, was removed; Marshal Ligonier was very old, and was governed by him; and by his seat in the Ordnance, and his own address, he began to balance Fox in the direction of the Duke of Marlborough. But his imperious temper was not to be restrained; and at this very period, he wantonly

started an enemy, under whose lash he had reason afterwards to wish he had not fallen. A considerable officer was Lord Tyrawley, too old to give jealousy to Lord George, and who, having been neglected by the Duke of Newcastle, had treated the latter with a contempt, which, beside attaching himself to Fox, had assured an entire stop to his own farther advancement. Lord Tyrawley had a thorough knowledge of the world, though less of his own country than of others; he had long been minister in Portugal, where he grew into such favour, that the late king, to keep him there, would have appointed him his general. He had a great deal of humour and occasional good breeding, but not to the prejudice of his natural temper, which was imperiously blunt, haughty and contemptuous, with an undaunted portion of spirit. Accustomed to the despotism of Portugal, Muscovy, and the army, he had little reverence for parliaments, and always spoke of them as the French do of the long robe; he even affected not to know where the House of Commons was. He was just returned from Gibraltar, where he had ordered great additions to the works, with no more economy than governors are apt to do who think themselves above being responsible. Lord George Sackville caught at this dissipation, and privately instigated Sir John Philipps to censure

the expense. To their great surprise Lord Tyrawley demanded to be heard at the bar of the House of Commons, in his own defence. A day was named. Lord Tyrawley drew up a memorial which he proposed to read to the House; and which in the meantime he did read to every body else. It was conceived in bitter terms against Lord George, and attacked him roundly on having avoided all foreign command. This alarmed Lord George, who got the day of hearing adjourned for near a fortnight: but Lord Tyrawley was not a man to recede from his point: and Lord George having underhand procured the report of Skinner, who surveyed the works at Gibraltar, to be brought before the House, without mentioning what it was, Mr. Fox laid open the unhandsome darkness of this conduct, and Lord Tyrawley himself appeared at the bar. As the hearing was before the committee, high words were avoided, which must have ensued, had the Speaker, who was not wont to suffer disrespect to the House, been in the chair, for Lord Tyrawley made good by his behaviour all that had been taken for vapour before he appeared there. He treated the House with great freedom, their forms with still greater; and leaning on the bar (though he was allowed a chair) he browbeat Skinner his censor, who stood on his left hand, with such arrogant

humour, that the very lawyers thought themselves outdone in their own style of worrying a culprit. He read his memorial, which was well drawn and somewhat softened, with great art and frankness, and assumed more merit to himself than he had been charged with blame. Such tough game tempted few hunters. Lord George was glad to wave the sport; and the House dismissed the affair with perfect satisfaction in the innocence of a man who dared to do wrong more than they dared to censure him."

I do not wish to extend these quotations to an unnecessary length, otherwise, I could point out the influence Lord George possessed in arranging different administrations, particularly Vol. II. p. 142, 210, 222, to which the reader is referred; which enter minutely into the cabinet differences between Lord Bute, the Duke of Bedford, the Earl of Chatham, &c. Lord George is by far the most prominent character of the day; without whose advice or knowledge, it seemed impossible for the ministry to act on any important occasion; so that we cease to wonder at the intelligence Junius evinces on all affairs connected with the court, when we become better acquainted with the high political station he once moved in. Neither can we wonder at his acrimony and invective against those very men who once looked up to

him for advice, when they afterwards so ungenerously united in aiding his downfall. And however sacred the middle classes of society, who know but little of political intrigue and the voice of faction, may hold the character of each other; and however unwarrantable they may conceive it for any one to contaminate that character by public exposure, yet we are to bear in mind that the fall of Lord George, naturally endowed with a high spirit, was sufficient to overcome the best intentions, and to induce him to expose to the world those measures which were withheld from the public eye, and which he had not an opportunity privately of censuring with sufficient severity. It is not my province to condemn or speak in favour of such a measure. The letters were written, and no doubt were productive of good to the country at large, however vindictive the intentions of the writer may have been. No one can read those letters without full confidence of an existing cause. That cause we are now investigating, which will be brought more fully to our notice in the concluding extracts.

“ Mr. Pitt, no less enterprizing than Frederic, but a little less informed, and a good deal less disposed to listen to information, determined to strike some mighty stroke on his part, that might combine his name with the glory of that

King, and cement and justify their harmony. Unfortunately, his mind was not purged of its vision of Rochfort, and he again chose the coast of France for the scene of his romance. A strong fleet was equipped of eighteen ships of the line, thirteen frigates, three sloops, four fire ships, and two bomb-ketches, and carrying an army of fourteen thousand landmen and six thousand marines. The Duke of Marlborough, on whom Lord George Sackville could not avoid attending, was appointed General. Commodore Howe was destined to lead the fleet ; on which Sir Edmund Hawke struck his flag ; but, being persuaded to resume it, accompanied Lord Anson, who took the command himself. The mode of volunteers, which the Duke had always discouraged, now revived ; Sir James Lowther, master of 40,000*l.* a-year, Lord Doune, Sir John Armitage, and others, embarked with the expedition. Lord Granby at the same time came into the service, and was appointed Colonel of the Blues ; and George Townshend, now there was no more question of the Duke, returned to the army and was restored on the foot of his former rank. The armament sailed on the first of June. Lord Anson, with the larger ships, kept out at sea ; Howe led the transports, which for some days were kept back by contrary winds, but anchored on the fifth in

Cancale Bay, near St. Maloes. The troops landed without opposition ; when the commanders (as in former expeditions) seeming dispatched, so scanty was their intelligence, to discover the coast of France, rather than to master it, soon discovered that the town was so strongly situated, and approachable only by a narrow causeway, that, after burning a parcel of smaller vessels, they returned to their ships ; and the French learned that they were not to be conquered by every Duke of Marlborough. The Duke himself was personally brave, and was eager to land on the first possibility ; but he had neither experience nor information, nor probability on his side adequate to such a bravado. However it was well for him that his miscarriage happened under the auspices of Pitt, not of Fox. Here, it was said, his Grace and his troops remarked that Lord George Sackville was not among the first to court danger ; and Howe, who never made a friendship but at the mouth of a cannon, had conceived and expressed strong aversion to him. It is certain, that both the Duke and Lord George were so sick of naval expeditions, that after parading before Granville and Cherbourg, they returned with the fleet to St. Helen's, and set out for the army in Germany, where the Duke took the command of the English forces.—The King would have hindered Lord

George from going to Germany; but he preferred it to expeditions, and would go; and did, even without kissing the King's hand. He had also offended Mr. Pitt, afterwards Earl of Chatham. Pitt had offered him the command of the expedition to St. Cas. Lord George replied, '*he was tired of buccaneering.*' It was to avoid that service that he had insisted on going to Germany—but Pitt did not forget the sarcasm on his expeditions."—1758, Vol. II. p. 304. Expedition to St. Maloes.

From this statement, we find Lord George had many enemies among those who were afterwards noticed by Junius. With Lord Howe he was avowedly on bad terms. The King he had offended. Pitt he had offended: and with respect to Sir James Lowther and Sir Edward Hawke, they might easily have said something to incur his displeasure. Lord Howe being a naval officer, had nothing to do with the affair at Minden—he is therefore only alluded to by Junius in general terms. Of Sir James Lowther, Junius says in Letter LVII.

“TO HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF GRAFTON.

“Your Lordship, perhaps, could see with pleasure the miseries of that devoted country [Westmoreland]; you could, perhaps, contemplate with inward satisfaction, the glorious and exalt-

ed figure of Sir James Lowther, while you beheld him with an air of triumphant dignity, ride in the whirlwind and direct the storm."

Of Sir Edward Hawke, Miscellaneous Letter LXVIII., Junius says—

"To what a poor insignificant condition has he now reduced himself! Behold him at such a conjuncture as the present, meanly keeping possession of an office which he owes to Lord Chatham's friendship, and distinguished as the only surviving minister who supports the present administration."

Of the Earl of Chatham, Miscellaneous Letter, XI.—

"I cannot admit, that because Mr. Pitt was respected and honoured a few years ago, the Earl of Chatham therefore deserves to be so now; or that a description which might have suited him at one part of his life, must of necessity be the only one applicable to him at another. It is barely possible, that a very honest commoner may become a very corrupt and worthless peer."

1758, Vol. II. p. 323, Lord Orford continues—

"While our army in Germany lay on the defensive, the fatal distempers incident to a camp raged there, and, in particular, carried off the Duke of Marlborough. The command of the English devolved on Lord George Sackville, between whom and Prince Ferdinand there was

by no means any cordiality. Both liked to govern, neither was disposed to be governed. Prince Ferdinand had gained an ascendant over the Duke of Marlborough, and Lord George had lost it; sufficient ground-work for their enmity. Lord Granby, the next in rank to Lord George, was an honest, open hearted young man, of undaunted spirit, and no capacity; and if he wanted any other recommendation to Prince Ferdinand, besides these ductile qualities, he drank as profusely as a German. *Lord George's haughtiness lost this young man*, as he had the Duke of Marlborough; Prince Ferdinand knew better how to bend in order to domineer."

I have already noticed Junius's pointed attack on Lord Granby; I therefore merely quote a paragraph here, in unison with Lord Orford's testimony of his inclination for the bottle, which Lord George had frequent opportunities of witnessing.

Letter III. To Sir William Draper.—

"I desire it may be remembered, that *I* never descended to the indecency of inquiring into his convivial hours. It is you, Sir William, who have taken pains to represent your friend in the character of a drunken landlord, who deals out his promises as liberally as his liquor, and will suffer no man to leave his table either sorrowful or sober. None but an intimate friend, who

must frequently have seen him in these unhappy, disgraceful moments, *could have described him so well.*”

An interesting account of the battle of Minden follows, which is too long for insertion here, the principal circumstances having been already detailed.

Lord Orford, Vol. II. p. 379, mentions Lord George's arrival in England.—

“ He immediately wrote to Lord Holderness to demand a court-martial. The demand was evaded for the present. He was told, the officers necessary were employed abroad. Lord Ligonier, the commander-in-chief, and *Lord Barrington, Secretary at War, were more explicit, and informed him that if he desired a court-martial, he must seek it in Germany.* This was followed by a message, delivered by the latter, acquainting Lord George, that not only the command of his regiment would be taken from him, but that he would be dismissed from his rank of general, and from his post of lieutenant-general of the ordnance; and Lord Barrington asked civilly if his Lordship chose to receive that notification then from his mouth, or in writing! Lord George preferred the latter. ‘That’, replied Lord Barrington, ‘will be easy; for I know but one precedent, that of the late Lord Cobham: I will send your Lordship the same.’ Lord George

smiled, and replied, ‘I hope your Lordship will send me a copy of Lord Cobham’s answer too.’”

Of Lord Ligonier, but little is said by Junius—merely a declaration of his knowledge, that the command of the army was taken from him contrary to his inclination.

Letter III. 7 July 1767.—

“Lord Ligonier *did not* deliver the army (which you, in classical language, are pleased to call a palladium) into Lord Granby’s hands. It was taken from him, much against his inclination, some two or three years before Lord Granby was commander-in-chief. As to the state of the army, I should be glad to know where *you* have received your intelligence.”

Lord Barrington was the principal actor in the business; no fewer than thirty pages of the pen of Junius are employed in exposing his conduct. We need only refer to the internal evidence of those letters, to prove they were written by a military man. One instance will suffice, connected with the subject before us.

Letter CVIII.—

“*After treating the most powerful people in the army with so much unprovoked insolence, it is not to be supposed that field-officers, captains, and subalterns, have any chance of justice at your hands.*”

The last letter but one that Junius ever wrote,

is dated May 8th, 1772; and near the signature is written Pall Mall, which, the reader will observe, is in unison with Lord George's letter to Lord Barrington, dated from thence, Sept. 1759, of which a copy is prefixed to this work.—This inadvertency is no where else to be found in any one of the letters.

We now proceed to the conduct of the Earl of Chatham, on this occasion.

Lord Orford, Vol. II. p. 380. "This behaviour of the court was not very intelligible; many even thought it had been concerted, as the gentlest way of letting Lord George escape. Certain it is, that their avoiding to call him to a trial, made him presume on his cause, and resolve to try to correct the severity of his fortune. On the other hand, the punishment seemed too rigid to a man untried, uncondemned, who asked a trial, and against whom no complaint was preferred in form. He had even, a fortnight after his disgrace, written to Prince Ferdinand, to know his charge. *The latter protested he had no complaint against him, nor had written a word in his disfavour, till on hearing the discourses in the camp.*"

"Tenderness to so old a servant as the Duke of Dorset, perhaps, made the King willing to avoid the last severity, which, should Lord George be condemned, would be difficult to

avoid. The officers of the fleet, who had seen an example made in their profession, would exclaim against partiality to a land-officer, the greatness of whose birth would be the obvious cause of such lenity. Mr. Pitt, too, was of no sanguinary complexion, though a rigid exactor of obedience. *From the first moment of Lord George's disgrace, Mr. Pitt warmly adopted the sentiments of Prince Ferdinand, whom he was determined heartily to support.* Though he went to visit Lord George in form, he by no means meant to protect him. He would not, he said, condemn any man unheard. But he was sworn to the German cause, and to the heroes, whose success reflected such lustre on his own administration, and concurred so much to give it stability. When Fitzroy returned to the army, Mr. Pitt charged him with the strongest assurances to Prince Ferdinand (as Fitzroy told Mr. Conway); 'Tell him,' said Mr. Pitt, 'he shall have what reinforcements, what ammunition he pleases—*tell him, I will stand or fall with him.*' Hearing, too, that Lord Mansfield was connected with Lord George, and the law intended to support him, 'The law', said Pitt, 'has nothing to do with that question.' Lord Granby succeeded Lord George Sackville in the ordnance, and General Waldegrave in the regiment."

From this statement it plainly appears, that

the Earl of Chatham, by his partial conduct, gave sufficient cause for Lord George's resentment.

1760, Lord Orford, Vol. II. p. 413. The following paragraph further explains the cause of his animosity to the House of Bedford.

“ Lord George Sackville, having waited till the officers returned from Germany, had written at the end of the year to Lord Holderness, demanding a court-martial. He received for answer, that it would be referred to the judges; a question having arisen, whether he could legally be tried, the orders he had disobeyed having been given by a foreigner. The attorney and solicitor-generals, however, not the judges, were the persons consulted, and they gave their opinions that he might have a court-martial. Another doubt had been started, whether, having been dismissed from the service, his lordship could yet be subject to military law; but this was then passed over; and, January 18th, Lord Holderness notified the opinion of the attorney and solicitor to Lord George, adding, that his Majesty desired to know how his lordship wished to have the proceeding, *as there was no specific charge against him.* This disculpation, under the hand of a Secretary of State, was remarkable. Some surmised that it had been contrived by Lord Mansfield, (at that time) a friend to Lord George. It was palpable, at least,

that the court had gone even this length, in order to hold out to Lord George an opportunity of not pushing the matter any further. He, notwithstanding, assuming to himself such a conviction of innocence, that he declared he would even accept of Lord Tyrawley (a brutal man, and one of his bitterest foes on that and former occasions,) for president of the court-martial, wrote in reply to Lord Holderness, 'That he had no business to accuse himself, nor had he been guilty of any fault; but that he concluded Prince Ferdinand must have exhibited some charge against him; otherwise, undoubtedly his Majesty would not have stripped him of every thing in so ignominious a manner; he therefore repeated his petition for a court-martial, and would abide the event.' Intimations at the same time were privately given to Lord George, that if he would desist from prosecuting the affair, the court would also. On the other hand, he was told, that be the consequence how severe soever, the King was firm to let the law take its course, should the court-martial once proceed. With any mitigation of his fate, if the event was sinister, Lord George could not flatter himself. He had too many and too powerful enemies to expect any remission. The King hated him, and hated those who favoured him, the Prince's faction. The Duke was as

ill-inclined to him. Fox, from private resentments, was his enemy. The army, whether the officers were attached to the Duke, to Prince Ferdinand, or to Lord Granby, were equally averse to him. Mr. Pitt, though *no bitter enemy*, had adopted Prince Ferdinand's cause. The people, too, who, in a free country, are reckoned for something, were prepossessed against him. In his own profession he had disgusted many, both of superior and inferior rank. Newcastle, who never felt for a powerless friend, had abandoned him. *The House of Bedford, from reasons of family, were not his well-wishers. The sister of the Duchess of Bedford had married Lord John Sackville and had quarrelled with Lord George."*

This was the state of things previous to his trial. Faction and clamour prevailed against him. Is it possible, in the annals of history, to point out such another remarkable instance of the deceitfulness of fortune's favours? Here we find a man of first rate talents, of high rank in life, suddenly shunned by all the Court, to gratify the jealousy of a foreign Prince, to whom he would not stoop, to gain those favours which were lavished on the Marquis of Granby and the Duke of Grafton's brother. Nor was this all. Party spirit at that time ran so high, that families allied by marriage joined in the univer-

sal censure. The origin of Junius's animosity is at once explained; even domestic affairs, unconnected with politics, being at times the subject of his pen.

In Letter xxix. he says—

“ Let the friends of the Duke of Bedford observe that humble silence which becomes their situation. They should recollect, that there are still some facts in store, at which human nature would shudder. *I shall be understood by those whom it concerns when I say, that these facts go farther than to the Duke.*”

Lord Orford continues—

“ On the 23d of January, 1760, he was acquainted that he should have a court-martial. It was appointed, and General Onslow constituted president. A messenger was despatched to Prince Ferdinand to send over evidence. To General Balfour, nominated one of his judges, Lord George objected, on the score of former enmity between them.

“ On the 28th of February, Lord Barrington acquainted the House of Commons, that Lord George Sackville had been put under arrest for disobedience of orders. The Speaker had been much averse to the trial of a member, who was no longer in the army, and hoped it would be opposed: but it was not. Lord Milton, brother-in-law of Lord George, was empowered by him

to say, that the trial was what he earnestly desired. Lord Barrington then moved an address of thanks to the King for the communication, and for his Majesty's tenderness of the privileges of the House. This being readily agreed to, Lord Barrington said it was *nemine contradicente* : but Doddington had faintly said no, and the Speaker said there had been a negative. Sir Francis Dashwood then said, that he had not opposed the address, as Lord George wished the trial ; but he hoped the measure would be considered hereafter in some mutiny bill, and that the time might be limited how long persons who had quitted the army should be liable to martial law. Doddington added, ' That every body seemed to agree it ought not to remain law ; that he did not think it law ; nay, that Lord George might have been tried while he was a military man. Martial law was growing upon us, would eat up the banks and overflow the whole. The mutiny-bill fell to the ground every year, but, like the giant, recovered new strength on touching it.' Sir John Rushout added, that were he in the army, he would not sit on the trial of any man out of it. Sir Francis Dashwood promised to call for a revisal of the mutiny-bill, if nobody else did.

“ The next day the court-martial met. When Lord George Sackville appeared before it, seeing

General Balfour on the bench, he said, 'he thought that officer had not been to sit on him, he having made his exceptions, and having been told Balfour should not be of the court.' Balfour said, 'he came not to be a judge, nor desired to be, but to know the exception, which he thought touched his honour'—a strong proof how dissonant courts-martial are from the spirit of the English constitution, which does not understand that persons accused are to be awed by points of romantic honour from excepting against their jury, if suspected of enmity or partiality. Lord George pleaded in opposition, that Balfour had exercised against him in the Ordinance. The court-martial voted that reason insufficient, but told Balfour they would excuse his attendance if he desired it—which he did. They had no such power either of voting the exception invalid, or of excusing him. The King had appointed him, and had allowed the exception. Their next step was more respectful to the laws, and came from a quarter which was not suspected of much tenderness to the prisoner. Lord Albemarle asked him if he was in the army? the judge-advocate, for the prisoner, answered, No. The court then was cleared, and adjourned to the following Thursday, desiring to have the opinion of the Judges, *whether a man no longer in the army was subject to martial law.* The

attorney and solicitor-generals had determined in the affirmative, grounding their sentiment on those words of the mutiny-bill, ‘ *All persons being officers on the 25th of March, and committing such and such faults within the course of the year, &c.*’ These words being in force as long as the bill, they thought comprehended such persons for the same period.

“ Lord Albemarle had gone farther ; he had asked if the court was empowered to inflict any punishment under capital on the delinquent. This provision of tenderness was not expected from the favourite of the Duke of Cumberland, or from one who had expressed himself warmly enough against Lord George. Private reasons were sought for this conduct by those who would not suppose that in *that trial any motives but those of passion or interest would be hearkened to.* They who canvassed Lord Albemarle’s behaviour under such prejudice accounted for it by the Duke’s envy of Prince Ferdinand, and desire of rescuing even that *hated criminal* from his vengeance—yet were those but surmises, not corroborated by any appearance of acrimony in the complexion or conduct of the judges. So ill, however, was Lord Albemarle’s obstruction of the proceedings accepted by the King, *who now pushed on the trial angrily and indecently,* that his mother, Lady Albemarle, was omitted in the

private nightly parties at the Court, and not spoken to in the morning drawing-room. The King went further ; Prince Ferdinand was impatient for the return of the officers ; General Onslow, president of the court-martial, was member of another on Lord Charles Hay, a brave but mad officer, who having in America reflected on the dilatoriness of Lord Loudon, had been put under arrest by him. Onslow at that trial was seized with an apoplectic fit and died.

“ The King was so impatient of any delay on Lord George Sackville’s case, that the Duke of Newcastle, at four in the afternoon, was ordered to send to the Secretary of War (Lord Barrington), then in the House of Commons, directions to have a new commission made out that very evening, that not a day might be lost. Four more members too were added to the Court, to guard against any deficiency, the law allowing not a greater number than twenty-one, nor less than thirteen.

“ Ten Judges (the other two, Bathurst and Clive, of which the former held Lord George’s trial illegal, being absent on the Circuit,) gave their opinions, that, as far as they could then see, he might be tried ; but they reserved to themselves a further consideration, if any appeal should be made from the sentence. On

the very day on which they were to deliver their opinion, arrived the account of Thurot's defeat and death. There was a great Court to congratulate the King ; yet so impatient was he to learn the decision of the bench, that he scarce staid a moment in the drawing-room. *In private he expressed without decency, his apprehensions of what the German Princes would think of his want of power, should he not be able to obtain Lord George's trial and condemnation.* The moment he was certified that the trial might proceed, he named General Pulteney president of the court in the room of Onslow ; and Pulteney excusing himself, Sir Charles Howard was appointed. March 7th, the trial re-commenced. Lord George, who treated his adversaries with little management, desired the judge-advocate to explain to Wintzenrode, Prince Ferdinand's aid-de-camp, the nature of perjury ; the German replied handsomely, that he understood it both from religion and honour, and supposed it was the same in all countries."

The trial being in print it is not necessary to recapitulate.

" Lord George's own behaviour was most extraordinary. He had, undoubtedly, trusted to the superiority of his parts for extricating him. Most men, in his situation, would have adapted such parts to the conciliating the favour of his

judges, to drawing the witnesses into contradictions, to misleading and bewildering the court, and to throwing the most specious colours on his own conduct, without offending the parties declared against him. Very different was the conduct of Lord George. From the outset, and during the whole process, he assumed a dictatorial style to the court, and treated the inferiority of their capacities as he would have done if sitting among them. He browbeat the witnesses, gave the lie to Sloper, and used the judge-advocate (a Scotchman), though a very clever man, with contempt. Nothing was timid, nothing humble in his behaviour. His replies were quick and spirited. He prescribed to the court, and they acquiesced. An instance of such resolution at Minden, had established his character for ever.

“The trial had lasted longer than was expected. The Mutiny-bill expired; a new warrant was forced to be made out, and the depositions were read over to the witnesses. It was the third of April before the whole proceeding was closed: the event different from what Lord George had presumed, and yet short of what he had reason to expect. The court-martial pronounced him guilty of having disobeyed Prince Ferdinand’s orders, whom, by his commission and instructions, he was ordered to obey: and declared it

their opinion that he was unfit to serve his Majesty in any military capacity whatever.

“The King confirmed the sentence, but, dissatisfied that it had gone no farther, he could not resist the ungenerous impulse of loading it with every insult in his power: impotent, as circumscribed in narrower limits than his wishes; and unjust, as exceeding the bounds of a just trial; since no man ought to be punished beyond his sentence. The court-martial’s decision was directed to be given out in public orders to the army, *declaring the sentence worse than death.*

“The King struck Lord George’s name out of the council-book, and forbad his appearance at court. The Lord Chamberlain too was ordered to notify that prohibition to the Prince of Wales, and the Princess Dowager; and lest that should not be sufficient, *the Vice Chamberlain was sent to acquaint Lord Bute with it, who said, to be sure the Prince would not think of seeing Lord George while it was disagreeable to his Majesty.* Lord George’s witnesses and friends were threatened with no less cruelty. Hugo, a Hanoverian, was dismissed on his return to the army. John Smith*, was obliged to quit it here; and Cunningham was sent to America, though he had been there three times already. Yet not a murmur followed; as the object was obnoxious, even the dan-

* Father to Sir Sidney Smith.

gerous precedent of persecuting witnesses who had thwarted the inclinations of the court, made no impression—so much do liberty and power depend on circumstances and seasons.”

Here we may particularly notice what Lord Orford says respecting the Princess Dowager and Lord Bute; both of whom prohibited the young Prince from seeing Lord George, after his disgrace: previous to this event they were on sociable terms.

Junius, in Letter xxxv., 19 Dec. 1769, says:—

“The plan of tutelage and future dominion over the heir apparent, laid many years ago at Carlton-house, between the Princess Dowager and her favourite, the Earl of Bute, was as gross and palpable as that which was concerted between Anne of Austria and Cardinal Mazarin, to govern Louis the Fourteenth, and, in effect, to prolong his minority until the end of their lives. That prince had strong natural parts, and used frequently to blush for his own ignorance and want of education, which had been wilfully neglected by his mother and her minion. A little experience, however, soon shewed him how shamefully he had been treated, and for what infamous purposes he had been kept in ignorance. Our great Edward too, at an early period, had sense enough to understand the nature of the connection between his abandoned mother and

the detested Mortimer. But since that time, human nature, we may observe, is greatly altered for the better. Dowagers may be chaste and minions may be honest. When it was proposed to settle the present King's household, as Prince of Wales, it is well known that the Earl of Bute was forced into it, in direct contradiction to the late King's inclination. *That* was the salient point from which all the mischiefs and disgraces of the present reign took life and motion. From that moment, Lord Bute never suffered the Prince of Wales to be an instant out of his sight. We need not look farther."

This is in unison with Lord Orford's testimony: and Lord George, in his character of Junius, had cause to remember the events alluded to. He had also an opportunity of knowing the disposition, talents, and character of the young King, from having been so much in his company previous to his disgrace; which accounts for the positive assertion of Junius, in his letter to the Reverend Mr. Horne, 24 July 1771,—

*"I know that man much better than any of you. Nature intended him only for a good-humoured ****; a systematical education with long practice has made him a consummate hypocrite."*

We now return to the conduct of George the Second. Such a wanton exercise of the prerogative was sufficient to inflame the mind of any

man, who possessed a spark of fine feeling. This one act was sufficient to tarnish the reign of George the Second, had he previously been ever so popular. It was an act of gross injustice, which in our times would undoubtedly have called aloud for redress, and which would have been obtained. Not so under that administration, the greater part of whom were more or less elevated by the result ; and Lord George himself, calumniated, persecuted, condemned, and deprived of all his emoluments, sought in retirement a refuge from the sneers of the world, and probably meditated those powerful attacks, which, in after years, were destined to make so deep an impression on his countrymen in general, and on those in particular who contributed in any way to his disgrace.

It is not for us to judge, far less to condemn, his mode of retaliation, otherwise we might perhaps call it ungenerous and unmanly. It is sufficient for us to prove, that time had not obliterated the keenest sense of his wrongs, and that, no longer called upon to *act*, he still suffered for himself and his country.

Having now given a full, fair, and, we trust, an impartial account of the causes, natural and political, which contributed to Lord George Sackville's decline and fall, our next endeavour will be to prove those qualifications, which, in

the Preface, we mentioned as essential to the character of Junius; and finally, that such qualifications actually centered in him.

As we advance in our enquiry, the facts presented to our notice are so clear, the arguments so unanswerable, and the inferences so conclusive, that we are persuaded every candid reader must allow that our endeavours to throw light on this hitherto obscure, but interesting subject, have not been in vain: on the contrary, that the shades of doubt are dispelled, events hitherto withheld from the world, are made perfectly intelligible, and the object which the writer had in view of setting this question at rest for ever, satisfactorily accomplished.

CHAPTER II.

THE first testimonial which we have to adduce as characteristic of Junius, is

Article I.—That Junius was an Englishman.

In the dedication of his Letters to the English nation he says, “Let it be impressed upon your minds, let it be instilled into your children, that the liberty of the press is the palladium of all the civil, political, and religious rights of *an Englishman*, and that the right of juries to return a general verdict, in all cases whatsoever, is an essential part of *our Constitution*, not to be controuled or limited by the judges, nor in any shape questionable by the legislature.”

In the preface,—“I am no lawyer by profession, nor do I pretend to be more deeply read than *every English gentleman* should be in the laws of his country.”

Again,—“I am far from meaning to impeach the Articles of the Union. If the true spirit of those articles were religiously adhered to, we should not see such a multitude of Scotch commoners in the lower House, as representatives

of English boroughs, while not a single Scotch borough is ever represented by an Englishman. We should not see English peerages given to Scotch ladies, or to the elder sons of Scotch peers, and the number of sixteen doubled and trebled by a scandalous evasion of the Act of Union. If it should ever be thought advisable to dissolve an act, the violation or observance of which is unvariably directed by the advantage and interest of the Scots, I shall say, very sincerely, with Sir Edward Coke, ‘When poor England stood alone, and had not the access of another kingdom, and yet had more and as potent enemies as it now hath, yet the King of England prevailed.’ ”

“The political freedom of the English Constitution was once the pride and honour of an Englishman. The civil equality of the laws preserved the property, and defended the safety of the subject. Are these glorious privileges, the birth-right of the people, or are we only tenants, at the will of the ministry? But that I know there is a spirit of resistance in the hearts of *my countrymen*, that they value life, not by its conveniences, but by the independence and dignity of their condition, I should, at this moment, appeal only to their discretion. I should persuade them to banish from their minds all memory of what we were; I should

tell them, this is not a time to remember *that we were Englishmen* ; and give it as my last advice, to make some early agreement with the minister, that since it has pleased him to rob us of those political rights which once distinguished the inhabitants of a country where honour was happiness, he would leave us, at least, the humble, obedient security of citizens, and graciously condescend to protect us in our submission.”—Letter xxx., 17th October 1769.

“ At such a moment no honest man will remain silent or inactive. However distinguished by rank or property, in the rights of freedom, we are all equal. *As we are Englishmen*, the least considerable man among us has an interest equal to the proudest nobleman in the laws and constitution of his country, and is equally called upon to make a generous contribution in support of them ; whether it be the heart to conceive, the understanding to direct, or the hand to execute.”—Letter xxxvii., 19 March 1770.

“ The people of England are by nature somewhat phlegmatic. This complexional character is extremely striking, when contrasted with the suddenness and vivacity of many of our neighbours on the Continent. It even appears remarkable among the several kindred tribes, which compose the great mass of the British Empire. The heat of the Welch, the impetuo-

sity of the Irish, the acrimony of the Scotch, and the headlong violence of the Creolians, are national temperaments very different from that of the *native genuine English*.

“This slowness of feeling is, in some respects, inconvenient; but, on the whole view of life, it has, I think, the advantage clearly on its side. *Our countrymen* derive from thence a firmness, an uniformity, and a perseverance in their designs, which enables them to conquer the greatest difficulties, and to arrive at the ultimate point of perfection in almost every thing they undertake.”—Miscellaneous Letter XIII., 24 Feb. 1768.

In his dedication to the “*English Nation*”, he begins by saying, “I dedicate to you a collection of Letters, written by *one of yourselves*, for the common benefit of us all.”

Bishop Berkley in his Five Hundred Queries has not inserted the following:

“Whether Scotland and Ireland constitute a part of the English nation?”—I think not, but it is easy to prove that Junius belonged to neither of those countries, if the miscellaneous letter should be thought insufficient.

First—That he was not an Irishman.

“I beg you will convey to your gracious Master my humble congratulations, upon the glorious success of peerages and pensions, so

lavishly distributed as the rewards of Irish virtue.”—Letter LXVII., Nov. 27, 1771.

“Or a Scotch secretary teaching the *Irish people* the true pronounciation of the English language. That *barbarous people* are but little accustomed to figures of oratory, &c.”—Miscellaneous Letter v., 16 Sept. 1767.

“Void as you are of every shame, can you without a blush, *but a blush seldom tinges those happy countenances which have been bathed in the Liffey*, can you recommend to the people of England, as ministers, men whose weakness or villainy they have already experienced in office?”—Letter LVII., 16 June 1769.

Secondly—That he was not a Scotchman; from his violent antipathy to that nation, which is evident throughout his Letters. I shall insert a few extracts only.

In the preface. “We must be conversant with the Scots in private life, and observe their principles of acting to us and to each other; the characteristic prudence, the selfish nationality, the indefatigable smile, the persevering assiduity, the everlasting profession of a discreet and moderate resentment. If the instance were not too important for an experiment, it might not be amiss to confide a little in their integrity. Without any abstract reasoning upon causes and effects, we shall soon be convinced by experience,

that the Scots, transplanted from their own country, are always a distinct and separate body from the people who received them. In other settlements they only love themselves: in England they cordially love themselves, and as cordially hate their neighbours.”

“When the loyalty of Tories, Jacobites, and Scotchmen has once taken possession of an unhappy Prince, it seldom leaves him without accomplishing his destruction.”—Letter xxxviii., 3 April 1770.

“Permit me to begin with paying a just tribute to Scotch sincerity wherever I find it. I own I am not apt to confide in the professions of gentlemen of that country; and when they smile, I feel an involuntary emotion to guard myself against mischief.”—Letter xli., Nov. 14, 1770.

“Is there no room at St. James’s but for Scotchmen and Jacobites?”—Letter l., July 9, 1771.

“The cunning Scotchman never speaks truth without a fraudulent design.”—Letter lix., Oct. 5, 1771.

It is evident there must have been a cause for the great antipathy invariably displayed by Junius against the whole Scotch nation. Whatever private opinions individuals may evince on this subject, such opinions are generally confined

to a narrow circle ; but in the instance before us, we are confident some wound must have been inflicted on Junius, to account for his satirizing them with such marked contempt.

Lord Orford entertained the opinion that because Lord George Sackville was on familiar terms with a few Scotch officers *previous to his disgrace*, that the Scotch nation was favourable to his cause. In this instance, however, his ideas are founded on false principles. Lord George detested Scotland, which is clearly proved by one of his own letters from Perth during the Rebellion. Had the Scotch been favourable to him, he must, according to the nature of things, have been acquitted on his trial, whereas, the whole of the Scotch officers (being, in point of number, more than one half who presided at the court-martial) declared against him. Nor is this a solitary instance. We have evidence to prove, that, *previous to his trial*, the pen of slander was freely exercised in a certain quarter, in condemning his conduct at Minden. The press at Edinburgh was not backward in this respect. I have selected the following letter as a specimen of the freedom of that press at this important era. The most philosophic mind could never forget such a torrent of calumny and abuse, couched in language galling to the feelings of

any private individual, much more so to a nobleman whose life was at stake. Without seeking further, it is sufficient to convince us, that the whole nation afterwards smarted for so gross an act of injustice, which was so widely circulated. To this subject Junius evidently alludes in his description of the seat of inspiration in Northern writers, Miscellaneous Letter v.

It is much to be regretted that there is no possibility now of tracing the party who wrote the letter, it having been circulated anonymously. Lord George threatened the printers with a prosecution, which he afterwards abandoned. He however wrote a pamphlet in defence of the insinuations thrown out against his character, *and employed Mr. Woodfall to print it.* This pamphlet I have tried to procure, but in vain.

The following is a copy of the Scotch Letter alluded to, and which was printed at Edinburgh for Sands, Donaldson, Murray, and Cochran, in 1759.

A LETTER TO A LATE NOBLE COMMANDER OF
THE BRITISH FORCES IN GERMANY.

“ MY LORD,

“ I SHALL make no apology for addressing you in this public manner. In a free nation, every man who fills a post of trust and importance, is accountable to his fellow-citizens for the just discharge of his duty. Every one is deeply in-

terested in his behaviour ; every one, therefore, has a right to scrutinize his conduct ; every one has the privilege of expostulating with him on the merits of his actions.

“ I am moved by no personal animosity, heated by no party, instigated by no faction. Though I mourn principally for the public, I nevertheless feel for you in particular. I do not mean to add insult to misfortune. I do not endeavour to raise a fatal prejudice against you, and anticipate public judgment before you are *legally* convicted of public offence. I am sensible of the danger of influencing the multitude under a free government. When a popular tumult has been industriously raised, I know that justice has been too often sacrificed to appease it.

“ No one can be ignorant of the cruel means which were used to inflame the public against a late unhappy delinquent, and chief commander at sea [Admiral Byng]. Before he had set his foot on shore, papers and pamphlets pronounced his condemnation: he was borne along the streets by the mob as a spectacle of infamy, and hung in effigy.

“ During his trial, every article of examination underwent the severest comment. The charges against him fell under the heads of *cowardice*, *negligence*, or *disaffection*. His judges unanimously acquitted him of the *first* and *last*. He died—for his negligence.

“ If justice obliged them to condemn him, yet his *negligence* was not thought so capital as to exclude him from *mercy*. His judges unanimously and warmly recommended him as a fit object of royal clemency. The clamour which this recommendation occasioned, is recent in every one’s ears. The demands of justice were loud from every quarter; the walls in every street were defaced with scrolls, which called for vengeance; majesty itself was threatened, and popular rage dared to interfere with the exercise of the most noble prerogative of the crown. I do not mean however, to insinuate that public clamour influenced the royal determination. Our Sovereign has not only the disposition, but the fortitude, to be just. Had it been a time for clemency, the delinquent had not fallen a victim to the rigour of his sentence.

“ The occasion called for severity. The offence was proved: the law declared the punishment: the nation demanded execution: and the Sovereign approved of it. Justice had its free course, and established an example, to the terror of future offenders.

“ You, my Lord, are supposed to have been zealous in promoting this example. Prompted, no doubt, by the principle which actuates every generous mind, you paid no regard to the wealth of the delinquent, to his noble alliances, or high

rank in the navy. You considered an individual, however great, to be of little importance, when placed in competition with the public. These considerations, it is presumed, influenced you to urge his doom. You had the nation on your side. You had more ; you had justice to support your conduct.

“ No one can condemn the zeal which inspires us with resentment against delinquents who betray their honour, and abandon the interests of their country. The principle is noble ; but we certainly ought to be careful in what manner we direct it. Our indignation should not transport us so far as to take facts for granted before they are proved in a course of legal examination.

“ This caution I mean to observe in examining the circumstances of your supposed criminality. I would not hire a mob to bear you aloft as an object of hatred or derision : I would not bribe them to hang you in effigy ; neither shall my pen proclaim you either *cowardly*, *negligent*, or *disaffected*, before you have been heard in your own vindication.

“ Whether it be adviseable or not to send the forces of Great Britain to fight in Germany, is a subject which has been much controverted, and is quite foreign from my discussion. It is sufficient for the present purpose that it was thought expedient by those whose influence

caused them to be transported : and whatever might be the sentiments of particulars, it is certain, that the approbation of the kingdom in general gave a sanction to the measure.

“ No troops were ever animated with more distinguished ardour. Commanders among the first rank in nobility, volunteers of fashion and fortune, all nursed in the downy lap of ease, forsook at once the pomp of a court, the joys of a new-wedded love, with all the pleasures of a luxurious town, and crowded to the German shore, to experience hardships, brave dangers, and stand in the front of death.

“ The common men were worthy of their leaders. They were picked and culled from the flower of the British army. Strength, spirit, and comeliness, were their characteristics. The command of those brave bands devolved upon your Lordship.

“ Had the public choice directed the appointment, perhaps no one could have been found more likely to discharge the important duty with honour, skill, and fidelity. Descended from one of the noblest stocks in the kingdom, one eminently distinguished for loyalty, and yourself honoured with the confidence of your Sovereign, who would suspect you of disaffection? Having been tried in action, and your firmness extolled, who could doubt your courage? of which you

are said to bear honourable marks, where it is a soldier's pride to shew them—in your breast. From the proofs you had given of your abilities here, and in a neighbouring kingdom more especially, who could question your capacity?

“ With these impressions in your favour, you entered upon a command of such high consequence to your country, and such distinguished honour to yourself. Noble from your birth, great in your endowments, every thing great and noble was expected from your conduct.

“ To your country's detriment, and your own dishonour, the expectations of the public are disappointed. We looked for a commander, and we find a commentator. We depended upon an active warrior, and we meet with an idle disputant; one who, in the field of battle, debates upon orders with all the phlegm of an academic, when he ought to execute them with all the vigor and intrepidity of an hero.

“ It has too long been a reproach to Great Britain, that her generals were unworthy to lead the men they commanded. The strength and bravery of our soldiers has been highly extolled, but the skill and prowess of our officers has been held in slight estimation.

Our enemies, on the contrary, have been remarked for the conduct and intrepidity of their commanders, but their men have always been

stigmatized as weak and pusillanimous ; furious at the first onset, but suddenly disheartened by a repulse.

“ The British commanders, it is true, have, by their gallant behaviour in the late action, effaced this impression to their disadvantage. The several noble names which stand distinguished in the list of those who received the thanks of their general, are so many shining testimonies, that the officers of Great Britain are not ignorant of discipline, or regardless of glory. But though this stigma is removed, it is not wiped off by you, my Lord. It was for you to clear the staff from the stains of reproach, that it might no longer be said, that English soldiers only wanted French officers, to be a match for the combined force of Europe. In short, you had every thing great and glorious in prospect : you had nothing to lose—but your honour ; for a soldier’s life cannot be properly called his own.

“ A commander, when he receives his commission, devotes his life to his country. He undertakes to be valiant ; and, in consideration of that engagement, he holds an eminent rank in society, and is honourably supported at the public expence.

“ Why do thousands obey the nod of one man, but because his conduct is to guide, his

example to animate them, in the pursuit of glory? In the day of enterprise he is to repay his countrymen the obligations which he owes them, for the hours of honourable ease which, at their cost, he enjoyed in time of peace.

“ You, my Lord, have too much reflection to have suffered these considerations to escape your notice. You must know what was expected from you: you must be sensible what you owed to your own character, and what was due to your country. How comes it then that the busy voice of Fame makes bold with your reputation, and proclaims your behaviour on the day of battle to have been such as is totally inconsistent with every motive which can influence a wise man, or determine a brave commander?

“ Public rumour begets public prejudices. It is fit that you should be acquainted with the reports that are propagated relating to your conduct. It is friendship to repeat them. Knowing them, you may, and I wish that you may, be able to remove them. Thus then the tongue of public report tells the black tale against you.

“ It is said, that on the 1st of August, when the confederate army was drawn up against the forces of France and her allies, when the immediate security of his Majesty's German dominions, when the honour and interest of your

king and country, together with your own reputation, depended on the decision of the field; on that signal day, when the action grew warm, and became worthy of your interposition, it is said that his Highness Prince Ferdinand, the commander-in-chief, dispatched one of his aid-de-camps to you, with orders for you immediately to attack a particular body of the enemy's troops.

“ Instead of an instant compliance with these orders, it is reported that you hesitated, and at length intimated that there must be some mistake in the delivery or the injunction of those orders. On the aid-de-camp's persisting to repeat them, it is said (which, I own, is scarce credible), that your confusion carried you so far, that you inconsiderately asked the aid-de-camp, whether the orders he brought were in writing? Upon his answering, with some surprise, in the negative, you are further reported to have added, ‘ that you would speak to the Prince yourself.’ Before you could find an opportunity of addressing yourself to his Highness, however, the occasion for which your service was required is said to have been irretrievably lost: a consequence which might reasonably have been expected from such delay.

“ A consequence nevertheless extremely fatal, and which renders your supposed failure more

grievous and unpardonable, if it is true, which many affirm, that the greatest part of a whole regiment of bold and gallant Britons were cut to pieces, for want of being supported by the attack which you were ordered to make. Highly culpable as, from such behaviour, you are supposed to have been, a further opportunity yet offered, as it is said, which had you embraced it with vigour, would, in some degree, have restored your credit, and made some reparation for the calamitous effects occasioned by your former unaccountable failure.

“When the conduct and valour of the confederate army, though not seconded by your endeavours, had repulsed the enemy, and routed their forces, his Highness, we are told, again sent to you, by another of his aid-de-camps, and ordered you to pursue a flying party of the enemy.

“To these orders likewise you are supposed to have refused obedience. The reasons affirmed to have been given by you, in justification of your refusal, no less disgrace your capacity, than the refusal itself seems to dishonour your courage or your integrity.

“You are said to have answered the aid-de-camp who brought your orders for the pursuit, ‘That you were a stranger to the road, and unacquainted with the passes.’ Had this weak answer contained the least apology for your disobe-

dience, yet the supposed reply of the aid-de-camp stripped you even of the shadow of an excuse. It is asserted, that he offered 'to shew you the way himself, and conduct you with safety.' Thus driven to extremity, and left without the slightest pretence for disobeying the orders you had received, is it to be believed that you still demurred, and pushed your expostulations to the verge of mutiny? The answer which public rumour has put into your mouth, is indeed incredible. It is just that you should know it. It is affirmed, that, persisting in your disobedience, after long hesitation, you declared, 'That you did not think it adviseable to hazard his Majesty's troops.'

"Such is the shocking and dismal light in which your conduct is represented. The colouring is truly hideous: at present, however, we only see the dark side of the picture. It remains for you to exhibit the bright one in your own vindication.

"It is difficult for men in public stations to avoid creating enemies. Enmity and malice will aggravate venial omissions into capital failings. We ought not therefore to conclude you guilty of such glaring absurdity and unpardonable delinquency, till you have been heard in your defence.

"If, however, it should be found that you

have wilfully disobeyed the orders you received: if you should have no valid plea to offer in justification of such disobedience; if you should attempt to avail yourself of such sorry pretences as you are supposed to have urged in excuse for non-compliance, I tremble for your fate.

“Think on the demands of justice, which will be prosecuted against you by your injured, dishonoured, and enraged country. Reflect on the severe doom of a late unfortunate admiral, who atoned for his negligence with his life.—A punishment, in your own opinion, not too rigorous for an offence by which the public received prejudice. Think likewise how far the measure of his delinquency is exceeded by your own. He drew up his force, and actually engaged the enemy. It appeared however, that he did not engage with sufficient vigour and forwardness. He endeavoured to prove, that a nearer approximation was impracticable. His plea was found insufficient: he was doomed to die. But the sentence which adjudged him to death, was accompanied by a recommendation of the delinquent to mercy, as one who erred from defect of judgment. Notwithstanding this, notwithstanding the importunate petitions of noble relations, notwithstanding the pressing solicitations of powerful friends, yet—he obtained no reprieve. If then you should be found guilty

of the charge imputed to you, what title can you pretend to clemency? You cannot plead *error of judgment* in excuse of your delinquency. It was not a time to exercise your judgment, but to testify your obedience. But you are supposed to have conceived some mistake in the orders. Were they then wanting in perspicuity, or were you deficient in apprehension? They who are acquainted with your talents, will not suspect the latter: the world, which bears witness to his Highness's capacity, will not believe the former.

“ I will not suppose, that to cover a wilful disobedience you taxed the orders with obscurity or ambiguity, which were nevertheless clear to your conception; that would be such an aggravating circumstance, as would not only render the ears of mercy deaf to your supplications, but steel the heart of humanity against your sufferings.

“ To place your conduct in every candid light it seems to admit of, let us grant, that you really thought the commander-in-chief to have been mistaken in his orders, and that it was inexpedient and unadvisable to carry them into execution, yet remember, that they were orders for an attack. You did not approve of the mode prescribed, it was nevertheless your duty to pursue the substance of his directions.

“ If you were under strong conviction that

the plan of operation enjoined by the orders was injudicious and ineffectual, you had certainly better have disobeyed them by altering the scheme, and leading your men to action in a manner more conformable to your own judgment, you would have incurred less danger, and sustained less dishonour, by an attack inconsistent with your orders, than by an inglorious inactivity.

“ If you received orders to make an attack, that word at least must have been explicit. How then could you remain in inactivity? How could you spend the irrecoverable moments in commenting on your orders, and waiting for an explanation from your superior? But, above all, how could you stand an unmoved spectator, of the carnage before your eyes? How could you see your countrymen and fellow-soldiers, whom you was ordered to support, slaughtered within your view, and yet withhold your assistance?

“ This was adding inhumanity to disobedience. If you have feeling, mourn the loss of those gallant fellows, who will hereafter rise up in judgment against you. Their blood will fix indelible stains on your conscience never to be effaced.

“ Not only the lives of those immediately lost for want of your support, but of those who may hereafter fall in future actions, which might have

been prevented by having made this more complete and decisive, will be placed to your account, as victims to your disobedience.

“ Admitting that your orders were worded ambiguously, yet the word *attack* made the *substance* of them clear. Had you directed your attack to a wrong place, or in a wrong manner, the plea of misapprehension might have availed you ; at present it is of no weight ; for it is nowhere pretended that you received orders—to *stand still*.

“ In an army such as his Highness commands, the rigour of discipline ought to be particularly observed. They have more than a common stake to lose. They fight *pro aris et focis* ; and every one should be made sensible, that all their hopes depend on their own good conduct and intrepidity.

“ We have an evidence in M. Belleisle’s letter to M. Contades, of the sanguine and inhuman designs of the enemy. We find that large contributions were to have been exacted, and that Hanover was to have been made a downright desert.

“ Such were the barbarous intentions of a people who boast of being polished ! Such were the savage injunctions of a people who call themselves Christians ! A barbarity, too, directed to have been exercised against an innocent nation,

which, strictly speaking, is no party in the quarrel, and has done nothing to provoke such cruelty.

“ We may learn from their purposed inhumanity towards that Electorate, what treatment we are to expect should they ever gain footing on the English coast. O! what a reproach it is to human nature, that men in collective bodies should be guilty of shocking instances of injustice and brutality, for which, were they to act as individuals, each would condemn the other as an object of universal abhorrence and detestation, and pursue him as a savage monster, who ought to suffer death with the utmost severity of torture!

“ Can the number of offenders, then, change the nature of the offence? Is not that which would be a crime in one man, a multiplied crime in a million? Reason answers in the affirmative: and however casuists may urge the plea of political necessity, it will always be found eventually, that barbarous injustice is as contrary to political interest, as it is opposite to moral goodness.

“ But I forget that you have not been heard in your defence. Your country waits for an explanation: and every man of candour and impartiality wishes that your vindication may prove satisfactory.

“ In the meantime, I cannot forbear express-

ing my concern, that your unfortunate situation should affect an aged father and venerable peer, who has grown old by the side of his Sovereign, and, by a long life of loyalty and good services, has preserved the favour of his royal Master, without forfeiting the esteem of his fellow-citizens—a father, who deserved a better fate, than to have even a suspicion of dishonour light on so near a branch of his family. But though we lament his feelings, we admire his fortitude. Moved with the affection of a tender parent, he adheres to justice with a Roman vigour, and nobly scorns to interpose between an offending son and an injured country.”

Article II.—That Junius was a man of rank, and of independent fortune.

“ My letter of Monday will, I hope, convince the author that I am neither a partisan of Mr. Wilkes, nor yet bought off by the ministry. *It is true I have refused offers*, which a more prudent or a more interested man would have accepted. Whether it be simplicity or virtue in me, I can only affirm, that I am in earnest; because I am convinced, as far as my understanding is capable of judging, that the present ministry are driving this country to destruction; and you, I think, Sir, may be satisfied that *my rank and fortune* place me above a common

bribe.”—Miscellaneous Letter LIV., 12 April, 1769.

“ I should have hoped that *even my name* might carry some authority with it, if I had not seen how very little weight or consideration a printed paper receives, even from the respectable signature of Sir William Draper.”—Letter III., Feb. 7, 1769.

“ If any coarse expressions have escaped me, I am ready to agree, that they are unfit for Junius to make use of.”—Letter LIV., Aug. 15, 1771.

In the Preface he says,—“ I undertake this troublesome task, *merely* to serve a man, who has deserved well of me and of the public; and who, on my account, has been exposed to an expensive, tyrannical prosecution.”

“ My own works, you shall constantly have, and *in point of money*, be assured you shall never suffer.”—Private Letter to Mr. Woodfall, No. 6.

“ If your affair should come to a trial, and you should be found guilty, you will then let me know what expense falls particularly on yourself: for I understand you are engaged with other proprietors. Some way or other *you* shall be reimbursed.”—No. 59, Feb. 1770.

“ What you say about the profits is very handsome. I like to deal with such men. *As for*

myself, be assured that I am far above all pecuniary views, and no other person, I think, has any claim to share with you. Make the most of it, therefore, and let all your views in life be directed to a solid, however moderate, independance. Without it no man can be happy, nor even honest.”—No. 59, March 5, 1772.

“When I desired to have two sets sewed and one bound in vellum, it was not from a principle of economy. I despise such little savings, and shall still be a purchaser. If I were to buy as many sets as I want, it would be remarked.”—No. 58, March 3, 1772.

“*The greatest part of my property* having been invested in the Funds, I could not help paying some attention to rumours or events, by which my fortune may be affected; yet I never lay in wait to take advantage of a sudden fluctuation, much less would I make myself a bubble to bulls and bears, or a dupe to the pernicious arts practised in the Alley. I thought a prudent man, who had any thing to lose, and really meant to do the best for himself and his family*, ought to consider of the state of things at large, of the prospect before him, and the probability of particular events. A letter which appeared some days ago in the Public Advertiser, revived many serious reflections of this

* This proves Junius to have been a married man.

sort in my mind, because it seemed to be written with candour and judgment. The effect of those reflections was, that I did not hesitate to alter the situation of my property. I owe my thanks to that writer that I am safely *landed* from a troubled ocean of fear and anxiety, on which I think I never will venture *my fortune* and my happiness again.”—Miscellaneous Letter, 19 August 1768.

It is worthy of remark, that Lord George Sackville sold property out of the Funds about this time; by a decree of the Court of Chancery, Bolebrook, which is contiguous to the family estate of Buckhurst, was at this period ordered to be sold, and Lord George became the purchaser.

Article III.—That Junius was a man of highly cultivated talents, and of superior education; that he had successfully studied the language, the law, the constitution, and the history of his native country; but that he was neither a lawyer nor a clergyman.

It is impossible to read the Letters without being convinced of the truth of the former part of this Article; and, secondly, that he was not a lawyer, I have already given one decided instance, the following are conclusive:—

“As to lawyers, their profession is supported by the indiscriminate defence of right and wrong; and, I confess, I have not that opinion

of their knowledge or integrity, to think it necessary that they should decide for me upon a plain constitutional question.”—Letter XIV., June 22, 1767.

“You are a lawyer, sir, and know better than I do, upon what particular occasions a talent for misrepresentation may be fairly exerted; but to punish a man a second time when he has been once sufficiently chastised, is rather too severe.”—Letter XVIII., July 29, 1769. To Sir William Blackstone.

“Supported, as I am, by the whole body of the criminal law of England, I have no doubt of establishing my charge. If, on your part, you shall have no plain substantial defence, but should endeavour to shelter yourself under *the quirk and evasion of a practising lawyer*, or under the mere insulting assertion of power, without right, the reputation you pretend to, is gone for ever.”—Letter LXVIII., Jan. 21, 1772. To Lord Mansfield.

“Though I use the terms of art, *do not injure me so much as to suspect I am a lawyer*.—I had as lief be a Scotchman. It is the encouragement given to disputes about titles, which has supported that iniquitous profession, at the expense of the community.”—To Mr. Wilkes, 18 Sep., 1771.

“The city of London have expressed their

sentiments with freedom and firmness; they have spoken truth boldly; and in whatever light their remonstrance may be represented by courtiers, *I defy the most subtle lawyer in this country to point out a single instance in which they have exceeded the truth.*”—Letter xxxvii., March 19, 1769.

Thirdly,—That Junius was not a clergyman.

“The unfortunate success of the Rev. Mr. Horne’s endeavours, in support of the ministerial nomination of sheriffs, will I fear obstruct his preferment. Permit me to recommend him to your Grace’s protection. You will find him copiously gifted with those qualities of the heart, which usually direct you in the choice of your friendships. He too was Mr. Wilkes’s friend, and as incapable as you are of the liberal resentment of a gentleman. No, my Lord, it was the solitary, *vindictive malice of a monk*, brooding over the infirmities of his friend, until he thought they quickened into public life, and feasting with a rancorous rupture, upon the sordid catalogue of his distresses. *Now let him go back to his cloister. The church is a proper retreat for him.* In his principles he is already a bishop.”

“I quote his words, and conclude from them, that he is a true and hearty Christian *in substance, not in ceremony*; though possibly he may

not agree *with my Reverend Lords the Bishops, or with the head of the Church*, that prayers are morality, or that kneeling is religion.”—Letter LV., 26 Aug., 1771.

“ His Majesty’s predecessors had some generous qualities in their composition, with vices, I confess, or frailties in abundance. They were Kings or gentlemen, *not hypocrites or priests*. They were at the head of the Church, but did not know the value of their office. They said their prayers without ceremony, and had too little *priestcraft* in their understanding to reconcile *the sanctimonious forms of religion* with the utter destruction of the morality of their people.”—Letter LVII., 28 Sep. 1771.

Oct. 5, 1771—The fundamental principles of Christianity may still be preserved, though every zealous sectary adheres to his own exclusive doctrine, *and pious ecclesiastics make it a part of their religion to persecute one another.*”

Aug. 13, 1771—“ *The resentment of a priest is implacable*, no sufferings can soften, no penitence can appease him.”

28 Sep. 1771—“ Our religious, benevolent, generous Sovereign, has no objection to selling his own timber to his own admiralty, to repair his own ships, nor to putting the money into his own pocket. People of a religious turn naturally adhere to the principles of the Church.

Whatever they acquire falls into mortmain."

Finally,—A clergyman and Junius are totally dissonant from each other, owing to the incapacity of the former to hold a seat in the House of Commons.

On this subject he says,—“ We are enquiring whether incapacity be or be not created by expulsion. In the cases of Bedford and Malden, the incapacity of the persons returned was matter of public notoriety, for it was created by act of parliament. But, really, Sir, my honest friend's suppositions are as unfavourable to him as his facts. He well knows that the clergy, besides that *they are* represented in common with *their* fellow subjects, have also a separate parliament of their own ; that *their incapacity to sit in the House of Commons has been confirmed by repeated decisions of the House*, and that the law of Parliament, declared by those decisions, has been for above two centuries notorious and indisputed.”—Letter xx., 8 Aug, 1799.

Article IV.—*That Junius either was, at the time of writing the letters, or had previously been in the army, is evident, from his practical knowledge of military affairs.*

April 21, 1769—“ It seems you are also a volunteer with the stipend of twenty commissions.”

July 8, 1769—“ A submissive administration

was at last gradually collected from *the deserters* of all parties, interests and connexions; and nothing remained but to find a leader for *these gallant, well disciplined troops.*”

Feb. 7, 1769—“As if an appeal to the public were no more than *a military coup-de-main*, where a brave man has no rules to follow but the dictates of his courage.”

Sept. 19, 1769—“His palace is *besieged*; *the lines of circumvallation* are drawing round him.”

Feb. 14, 1770—“Neither the abject submission of *deserting his post in the hour of danger*, nor even the sacred shield of cowardice should protect him.”

Feb. 6, 1771—“*Not daring to attack the main body* of Junius’s last letter, he triumphs in having, as he thinks, *surprised an out-post and cut off a detached argument*, a mere *straggling* proposition. But even in this *petty warfare*, he shall find himself *defeated.*”

April 22, 1771—“*I may quit the service, but it would be absurd to suspect me of desertion.*”

“We cannot hinder their *desertion*, but we can prevent their carrying over *their arms to the service of the enemy.*”

June 22, 1771—“The profound respect I bear to the gracious Prince who governs this country, with no less honour to himself than

satisfaction to his subjects, *and who restores you to your rank under his standard*, will save you from a multitude of reproaches.”

Again, at the termination of the letter :—

“ You know the privy seal was intended for him ; and if you consider the dignity of *the post he deserted*, you will hardly think it decent to *quarter* him on Mr. Rigby.”

Aug. 15, 1771—“ Mr. Horne enlarges with rapture upon the importance of his services ; *the dreadful battles which he might have been engaged in, and the dangers he has escaped.*”

Again,—“ *Thanks are undoubtedly due to every man who does his duty in the engagement, but it is the wounded soldier who deserves the reward.*”

Sept. 28, 1771—“ *Corruption glitters in the van, collects and maintains a standing army of mercenaries, and at the same moment, impoverishes and enslaves the country.*” This alludes to the German troops.

Oct. 5. 1771—“ The favour of his country constitutes *the shield which defends him against a thousand daggers. Desertion would disarm him.*”

Speaking of Mr. Calcraft, an army agent :—

“ Let us profit by the assistance of such men while they are with us, and place them, if it be possible, in *the post of danger, to prevent deser-*

tion. The wary Wedderburne, the pompous Suffolk, *never threw away the scabbard, nor ever went upon a forlorn hope.*"

Wedderburne, Lord Loughborough, was afterwards Lord George's legal adviser.

Oct. 5, 1771—"What! though he [Mr. Calcraft] riots *in the plunder of the army*; and has only determined to be a patriot when he could not be a peer."

Lord Orford says that Mr. Calcraft applied to Lord George to be agent for his regiment, but he refused him.

Feb. 21, 1769—"It were unworthy of me to press you further. *The contempt with which the whole army heard of the manner of your retreat*, assures me, that, as your conduct was not justified by precedent, it will never be thought an example for imitation."

Who but a military man would trouble his head about Sir William Draper's disposal of his commission?

Oct. 17, 1769—"Far be it from me to insinuate the most distant reflection upon the army. On the contrary, *I honour and esteem the profession*: and if these gentlemen were better soldiers, I am sure they would be better subjects. It is not that there is any internal vice or defect in the profession itself, as regulated in this country, but that it is the spirit of this

particular corps to despise their profession : and that while they vainly assume the lead of the army, they make it matter of pertinent comparison, and triumph over the bravest troops in the world, I mean our marching regiments, that they indeed stand upon higher ground, and are privileged to neglect the laborious forms of military discipline and duty. Without dwelling longer upon a most invidious subject, *I shall leave it to military men, who have seen a service more active than the parade, to determine whether or no I speak truth.*”

Would a lawyer? would a clergyman? would any private gentleman? or any political writer, concern himself about a disturbance among a few officers at the horse-guards? No,—but Junius would—his conduct at Minden had been severely censured by three officers belonging to this corps, which is confirmed by his allusion again to the subject—15 Nov. 1769. “And leave it to them to determine, whether *I am moved by a personal* malevolence to three private gentlemen, or merely by a hope of perplexing the ministry.”

Aug. 22, 1770—“He [Mr. Luttrell, with whom Lord George was not on the most friendly terms] now says, that his great object is the rank of colonel, and that he *will* have it.”

Whether he procured it, or not, would signify

but little to a disinterested writer, but with military men, such changes are constantly the topic of conversation. Again:—

“The insult offered *to the army in general*, is as gross as the outrage intended to the people of England. What!” Junius exclaims, “Lieutenant Colonel Luttrell adjutant general of an army of sixteen thousand men?”

16 Oct. 1771—to Mr. Wilkes—“I thought your letter *about the military*, very proper, and well drawn.”

6 Nov. 1771—“Au reste—I see no use *in fighting* this question in the newspapers, nor have I time.”

Oct. 12, 1767—“This is the kind of *combat usually fought on*, and indeed, the only one adapted to the *field* of a public paper.”

Again—“Thus circumstanced, I will not take either part, but offer myself as a friend to both, *to measure the ground, give the word, and carry off the body of which-ever shall fall in the field of honour.*”

March 4, 1768—“It remained like an old piece of cannon I have heard of somewhere of an enormous size, which stood upon a ruinous bastion, and which was seldom or never fired, for fear of bringing down the fortification, for whose defence it was intended.”

Aug. 29, 1768—“You will not venture to in-

sinuate, that Sir Jeffery Amherst was dismissed by the advice of Lord Granby, or Sir Edward Hawke.—*Military men* have a sense of honour, which your Lordship [Lord Hillsborough] has no notion of. They feel for a gallant officer who had his full share in the toils and honour, and had some right to share in the profits of the war. They feel for the army and the navy. *Lord Granby has some emoluments besides his power,* and Sir Edward Hawke has his pension; nobly earned I confess, but not better deserved than by the labours which conquered America, in America. Besides, my Lord, the commander in chief is the patron of the army. It was a common cause which he could not desert without infamy and reproach. Lord Granby is not a man to take his tone from any minister. When his honour is concerned, he scorns to adopt an humble ministerial language: he never would say, that indeed Sir Jeffery Amherst was rather unreasonable—that his terms were exorbitant, that he had still two regiments left, and might well be contented. This is a language it is impossible he should hold, *while he himself is master-general of the ordnance, colonel of the Blues, with a whole family upon the staff.* He knows the value, and could not be sensible of the loss of those honourable rewards, which his *distinguished capacity, his care of the public money, and his*

able conduct in Germany, had justly intitled him to."

This is a very important extract, not only as it concerns his jealousy for Lord Granby's emoluments, but as it shews the pains he took to befriend Sir Jeffrey Amherst, whom I have previously mentioned as one of Lord George's most intimate friends.

4 March, 1768—"It seems they had hoarded up those unmeaning powers of the crown, as a *grand military* magazine, towards *breaking the fortunes and depressing the spirit of the nobility.*"

10 Sep. 1768—"You set out with asserting, that the crown has an indisputable power of *dismissing its officers without assigning a cause.* Not quite indisputable, my Lord; for I have heard of addresses from parliament, to know who advised the dismissal of particular officers. *I have heard of impeachments attending a wanton exertion of the prerogative,* and you perhaps may live to hear of them likewise."

It is scarcely necessary to remind the reader, how closely this applies to Lord George himself.

20 Sep. 1768—"I am not a soldier, my Lord, nor will I pretend to determine, what share of honour a general is entitled to for success, who must have borne the whole blame and disgrace, if he had failed. Had the event been unfavourable, his officers, I dare say, would have been

willing enough to yield their concern in it to the commander-in-chief. As to the rest, I have heard from military men, that the judgment and capacity which make resistance useless or impracticable, are rated much higher than even the resolution which overcomes it."

At the time of writing this letter, Lord George had been dismissed the service eight years. So that he might with truth say he was not a soldier.

30 Aug. 1768—"The dismissal of an experienced and deserving commander requires some attention."

This alludes to Sir Jeffery Amherst, the friend of Lord George.

21 Feb. 1770—"Instead of attempting to answer what I really do not understand, permit me to explain to the public *what I really know*. In exchange for your regiment you accepted of a colonel's half-pay (at least two hundred and twenty pounds a year), and an annuity of two hundred pounds for your own and Lady Draper's life jointly."

7 Feb. 1769—"As to the state of the army, I should be glad to know where *you* have received your intelligence. Was it in the rooms at Bath, or at your retreat at Clifton? The reports of reviewing generals, comprehend only a few regiments in England, which as they are imme-

diately under the royal inspection, are perhaps in some tolerable order. *But do you know any thing of the troops in the West Indies, the Mediterranean, and North America?*”

This was a question which Lord George could put with confidence, and answer with precision. The first from his friend General Clavering, who went over to Guadaloupe the same year that he went to Germany—the second from General Fowke, who was recalled from Gibraltar—the third from Lord Amherst, who was a considerable time at Montreal.

19 Oct. 1768—“His Grace had honourably *flesht his maiden sword in the field* of opposition, and had *gone through all the discipline* of the minority with credit.”

20 Nov. 1769—“If Captain Garth did not wilfully abandon his guard, why does he not demand a court-martial to clear his character?”

After the aspersions which had been thrown out against Lord George’s character, he did demand a court-martial, and obtained it.

19 Nov. 1770—“I don’t so much question Mr. Hervey’s being able to give good advice, as that other little man’s being either willing or able to follow it; but I should be glad to know which of them is to be responsible to the country for *the management of the army*, or whether they are invested with equal powers? Is Lord

Barrington the marksman, and General Hervey only the stalking horse? Or does the latter command, and that other do only as he is bid? This point I think ought to be explained; for if we don't know who commands the army, and any mischief should happen, the secretary-at-war and adjutant general will of course lay the blame on each other, and the nation never know which of them ought to be punished."

24 Nov. 1770—"Far be it from me to impeach his Majesty's judgment in *military matters*. Our gracious Sovereign cannot possibly have a *meaner opinion of his general officers than I have*. Yet, I own, there is one circumstance that a little surprises me. These poor creatures, it is agreed on all hands, have neither capacity nor experience; but one would think, that as soldiers and gentlemen, *they might shew a little spirit when they are insulted*. What! will they go to court again, to bow and cringe,—and fawn upon * * * * * who orders his official servant to point them out to their country, as a knot of asses!"

"On the very next day after the Accession of George the Third, and while the late King lay dead in his palace, Lord George Sackville made his appearance at St. James's, and was admitted to kiss the King's hand. This was looked upon as such an outrage on the memory of

the late King, and on the honour of those ministers who had the conduct of the German war, that they were perfectly astonished at it. They remonstrated strongly, and Lord George did not make his appearance at St James's during the remainder of that administration."—
Court Anecdotes.

This is a fact, so that we cannot wonder at the writer's precautionary remark.

28 Jan. 1772—"It is unlucky for *the army* that you should be so thoroughly convinced as you are, how extremely low you stand in their opinion. The consciousness that you are despised and detested by every individual in it, *from the drummer, whose discipline might be of service to you, to the general officer*, makes you desperate about your conduct and character. You think you are arrived at a state of security, and that being plunged to the very heels in infamy, the dipping has made you invulnerable."

Again—"My Lord, the rest of the world laugh at your choice; but *we soldiers* feel it as an indignity to the whole army, and be assured we shall resent it accordingly. Not that I think you pay much regard to the sensations of any thing under the degree of a general officer, and even that rank you have publicly stigmatized in the most opprobrious terms. Yet some of them, though, in your wise opinion, *not qualified to*

command, are entitled to respect. Let us suppose a case, which every man acquainted with the War-Office will admit to be very probable. Suppose a *lieutenant-general, who perhaps may be a peer, or a member of the House of Commons,* does you the honour to wait upon you for instructions relative to his regiment, &c.”

Lord George having been dismissed from the army, was not qualified to command, yet he considered himself entitled to respect. He had been a lieutenant-general, and commander-in-chief, was the son of a peer, also a member of the House of Commons. This paragraph merits particular notice in connection with Lord Barington's influence with the King at the time of his dismissal.

10 March 1772—“ Pray, my Lord, will you be so good as to explain to us, of what nature were those services which he first rendered to your Lordship? *Was he winged like a messenger? or stationary like a centinel?*”

Again—“ His zeal in the execution of this honourable office promoted him to another door, where he also *stands centry.*”

23 March 1772—“ *The army indeed is come to a fine pass, with a gambling broker at the head of it!*”

17 Feb. 1772—“ That stern and insolent minister *at the War-office* is pointed out to univer-

sal contempt and detestation ; you smile, indeed, but the last agonies of the hysteric passion are painted in your countenance. Your cheek betrays what passes within you, and your whole frame is in convulsions.”

I could enumerate many other striking instances, which are closely allied to this Article ; but it is time to proceed to the next, having now fully established the assertion that the writer was once a military character.

Article V.—That Junius moved in the immediate circle of the Court.

“ As to you, it is clearly my opinion, that you have nothing to fear from the Duke of Bedford. I reserve some things expressly to awe him, in case he should think of bringing you before the House of Lords. I am sure I can threaten him *privately* with such a storm, as would make him tremble even in his grave.”
—Private Letters to Mr. Woodfall, No. 10.

I have already mentioned Lord George’s connection and quarrel with the Bedford family.

“ Lord Chatham is determined to go to the Hall to support the Westminster remonstrance.”
—No. 22.

This circumstance could not possibly have been known to any one unless he moved in a high circle ; Junius probably heard of it through

some intimate friend of Lord Chatham's.—Junius was alive to every minute circumstance.

“ I think the argument about Gibraltar too good to be lost ; as to the satirical part, I must tell you, *and with positive certainty*, that our gracious * * * * is as callous as Stockfish, to every thing but the reproach of *cowardice*. That alone is able to set the humours afloat. After a paper of that kind he won't eat meat for a week.”—No. 33.

The writer must have had a positive knowledge of the King, to state this trifling circumstance, and the operation it would have upon the royal stomach.

“ Beware of David Garrick : he was sent to pump you, and went directly to Richmond, to tell the King I should write no more.”—No. 40.

“ I have no doubt of what you say about David Garrick—so drop the note. The truth is, that in order to curry favour, he made himself a greater rascal than he was. *Depend upon what I tell you* : the King understood that he had found out the secret by his own cunning and activity.”—No. 43.

“ What do you mean by affirming that the Dowager is better ? *I tell you she suckles toads from morning till night.*”—No. 46.

The Dowager was an enemy to Lord George

ever after the affair at Minden, which may account for Junius always speaking of her with so much contempt. *She was at this time* afflicted with a cancer, and died on the 8th of January in the following year.

April 24, 1769—"The Duke of Grafton, about this time, had separated himself from Anne Parsons, but proposed to continue united with her, on some Platonic terms of friendship, which she rejected."

This anecdote, totally unconnected with politics, could only be propagated by an enemy to the family.

Sept. 19, 1769—"At this interview, which passed at the house of the late Lord Eglintoune, Lord Bute told the Duke [of Bedford], that he was determined never to have any connexion with a man who had so basely betrayed him."

"The ministry having endeavoured to exclude the Dowager out of the Regency-bill, the Earl of Bute determined to dismiss them. Upon this the Duke of Bedford demanded an audience of the * * * *; reproached him in plain terms with his duplicity, baseness, falsehood, treachery, and hypocrisy; repeatedly gave him the lie, and left him in convulsions."

No one could have been acquainted with this remarkable circumstance, but one intimately connected with the Court.

“ When Earl Gower was appointed President of the Council, the King, with his usual sincerity, assured him, that he had not had one happy moment since the Duke of Bedford left him.”

Nov. 14, 1770—“ He [Lord Mansfield] said in the House of Lords, that he believed he should carry his opinion with him to the grave. It was afterwards reported that he had entrusted it, in *special confidence*, to the ingenious Duke of Cumberland.”

The secret appears to have been soon disclosed; whether it was broached by the Duke of Cumberland, an avowed enemy to Lord George, or by Lord Mansfield himself, is immaterial. It came through a channel to which no common personage could gain access. There are also a number of other trivial circumstances mentioned in various parts of the Letters, with which the public could be in no-wise interested, but which tended to inflame the parties concerned, and that was Junius's object. Such trifles were beneath the notice of a political writer, who professed to have the cause of his country at heart; nevertheless, they tend to prove to us that he moved in a high circle.

Article VI.—That Junius was a member of the Established Church.

This is admitted by *Philo-Junius*, August 26, 1771, which signature Junius himself acknowledges in his Private Letters to Mr. Woodfall.

“ If I thought Junius capable of uttering a disrespectful word of the religion of his country, I should be the first to renounce and give him up to the public contempt and indignation. As a man, I am satisfied, that he is a Christian upon the most sincere conviction. As a writer, he would be grossly inconsistent with his political principles, *if he dared to attack a Religion established by those laws, which it seems to be the purpose of his life to defend.*”

Again—“ These candid critics never remember any thing he says in honour of *our holy religion*; though, it is true, that one of his leading arguments is made to rest upon *the internal evidence which the purest of all religions carries with it*. I quote his words, and conclude from them, that he is a true and hearty Christian in *substance*, not in ceremony.”

I cannot withhold the following beautiful quotation, from the last Letter signed Junius, although not strictly applicable to the present Article:—

“ Grateful, as I am to the Good Being whose bounty has imparted to me this reasoning intellect, whatever it is, I hold myself proportionably indebted to *him*, from whose enlightened under-

standing another ray of knowledge communicates to mine. But neither should I think the most exalted faculties of the human mind a gift worthy of the Divinity, nor any assistance in the improvement of them a subject of gratitude to my fellow creatures, if I were not satisfied, that really to inform the understanding corrects and enlarges the heart.”

Junius appears to have been, in every sense of the word, a liberal Christian—forms of worship, without the substance, were contrary to his refined ideas. He tells us, that he differs from the Bishops in some points, and that freedom of opinion should be exercised on this subject as well as on political affairs. Such were the sentiments of Lord Viscount Sackville, which are particularly exemplified in his speech on the Clerical Petition, laid before the House on the 6th Feb. 1772.

“Though a warm and zealous friend to the church of England, I must, on this occasion, dissent in opinion from those who are supposed now to espouse her cause: and I will openly avow my sentiments, without the least dissimulation or mental reservation. I hope no man will think the worse of me for my frankness, or charge speculative tenets to my account as a crime. If we live in a learned age, and in a land of liberty, it cannot surely be dangerous for us to talk

as freely of religion as of politics. While we keep within the bounds of decorum, and preserve that respect which is due to long established institutions, we can incur no blame for exposing any absurdities which may have crept into our theological system. Are not we every day discovering imperfections in our civil establishment, and in consequence applying a remedy? Why should we not pursue the same plan with respect to our religious constitution? Like the other, it is the work of men's hands, and therefore not necessarily perfect. When I call it the work of men's hands, do not mistake me, sir, as if I charged imperfection upon the scriptures. Far be such presumption from my mouth. What I mean, is the creed reduced therefrom by our prelates: that systematical chain of doctrine called the Thirty-nine Articles. I beg pardon for what I am going say; but I must be explicit. *Nolo episcopari*. There are in the Thirty-nine Articles several tenets to which I can by no means assent. I am persuaded they are not warranted by scripture: and I am sure they cannot be reconciled to common sense. With what face then can those doctrines be imposed upon the consciences of men as articles of belief, which no man can believe? You would not have your clergy like St. Augustine, who wished that God Almighty would reveal some new mystery, abso-

lutely absurd and impossible, that by his ready acquiescence he might prove that his faith was not only bigger than a grain of mustard seed, but even able to remove mountains. In my apprehension, some of the articles are incomprehensible, and some self-contradictory. I have no doubt but many, nay, most of those who are, by the nature of their profession, obliged to subscribe to them, stand in the same predicament. Do you think it possible for such men sincerely and honestly to subscribe to what they deem absurdities and contradictions? If you mean to have only hypocrites and prevaricators, for teachers of the gospel, and to exclude the honest and conscientious, this is certainly the best plan imaginable. But, as I hope this is not your intention, I expect that you will open the doors of the church wide enough to admit those, who are likely to teach by example as well as by precept, and to be living sermons, already speaking to the eyes of the people.

“It is indeed objected to these petitioners, that they maintain heterodox opinions, and, particularly, that they deny the divinity of Christ. I can only vouch for those with whom I am well acquainted; and I must say, that as far as my knowledge extends, the charge is groundless. Some gentlemen from that part of the country from which I come, have, I find, signed the peti-

tion: and I cannot help doing them the justice to declare, that there are no where to be met with worthier members of the community, either in a religious or a civil light. The divinity of Christ they certainly never dreamt of disavowing; and the reflection is unjust, because it is unmerited. To my knowledge, they are orthodox with regard to the grand essentials of Christianity. It is no objection that they do not acquiesce in some of the Thirty-nine Articles. They have that in common with some of the greatest divines and philosophers that England ever produced. What think you of Clarke and Hoadley, of Locke and Newton? Would they subscribe in the literal and grammatical sense, as the nature of the thing requires? Their writings demonstrate the reverse. Is it not time then to remove so great a stumbling-block? For my own part, it appears to me a melancholy thought, and indeed a crying grievance, that my son, at sixteen, must subscribe, upon entering the University, to what I cannot understand, much less explain to him, at sixty. The matter certainly calls aloud for redress: and ought alone, as has been justly observed, to determine us to enter into the merits of the petition. Yet to consider the matter rightly, in what better situation than those aggrieved youths, are adults, to whom the Articles appear unintelligible or self-contradictory? As

the former, if they would not be debarred from entering the Temple of Science, must swallow the bitter pill of subscription ; so must the latter, if they would not lose the fruits of their former studies, and the expense of their education, and, in a word, forego every prospect in life? Is not this too great a trial for humanity? It is indisputably an abuse of the first magnitude, and demands a speedy and effectual remedy.

“Forbear then to tell us, that the petitioners are not respectable. Suppose the allegation true, yet still it can be here no reasonable objection, because we ought to attend to the merits of the cause, not to the numbers by whom it is supported. Had this argument prevailed when Luther undertook to expose the abuses of the Romish Church, what would have become of the Reformation? It would have been nipt in the bud, and this nation, as well as the rest of Europe, must have groaned under the tyranny of the Pope. Consider that reformation generally rises from small beginnings, and like fame gathers strength as it goes. Ancient establishments, however absurd, have a body of men interested to support them ; yet still, the force of truth finally surmounts every obstacle. Were not this the case, how could the Christian Religion have been first established? It had the powers of the earth to vanquish.

“ The religious systems of those days were not less zealously espoused by the priesthood and their adherents, than the Thirty-nine Articles are in our days. Had they been consulted, and made the sole arbitrators of this affair, as has been suggested in the present instance by the last speaker, Christianity must have been crushed in the birth. We should never have heard of the scheme of redemption, in which we now all rejoice, and in which all the ends of the earth are, or may be blessed. For these, and various other reasons, which may be urged, I hope that at least the petition may be brought up and read, if not examined and discussed. This we owe to justice. This we owe to decency. Reason and common sense call for it from our hands, and Christianity cannot otherwise be satisfied.”

Article VII.—That Junius was a Member of the House of Commons.

“ As to the House of Commons, there may be more danger. But even there, I am fully satisfied, the ministry will exert themselves to quash such an enquiry, *and on the other side, you will have friends*”—Private Letter, No. 15.

29 July, 1769—To Sir William Blackstone—

“ The remainder of your reflections upon Mr. Grenville’s conduct destroy themselves. He could not possibly *come* prepared to traduce

your integrity to the House. He could not foresee that you would even speak upon the question, much less could he foresee that you would maintain a direct contradiction of that doctrine which you had solemnly, disinterestedly, and upon soberest reflection, delivered to the public. *He came*, armed indeed with what he thought a respectable authority, to support what he was convinced was the cause of truth, and, I doubt not, he intended to give you in the course of the debate an honourable and public testimony of his esteem. Thinking highly of his abilities, I cannot, however, allow him the gift of divination."

14 Aug., 1769—"The truth of the matter is evidently this. Doctor Blackstone, while he was speaking in the House of Commons, never once thought of his Commentaries, *until the contradiction was unexpectedly urged, and stared him in the face.* Instead of defending himself upon the spot, *he sunk under the charge in an agony of confusion and despair.* It is well known *that there was a pause of some minutes in the House,* from a general expectation that the Doctor would say something in his own defence; but it seems his faculties were too much overpowered, to think of those subtleties and refinements which have since occurred to him. *It was then* Mr. Grenville received that severe

chastisement, which the Doctor mentions with so much triumph. ‘I wish the honourable gentleman, instead of shaking his head, would shake a good argument out of it.’ If to the elegance, novelty, and bitterness of this ingenious sarcasm, we add the natural melody of Sir Fletcher Norton’s pipe [the Speaker], we shall not be surprised that Mr. Grenville was unable to make him any reply.”

His farther antipathy to the Speaker I shall have occasion to notice in a subsequent Article.

28 May, 1770—“To support their former resolutions, they were obliged to violate some of the best known and established rules of the House. In one instance, they went so far as to declare, in open defiance of truth and common sense, that it was not the rule of the House to divide a complicated question at the request of a member. But after trampling upon the laws of the land, it was not wonderful that they should treat the private regulations of their own assembly with equal disregard. The Speaker, being young in office, *began with pretended ignorance*, and ended with deciding for the ministry. *We* were not surprised at the decision; *but he hesitated and blushed at his own baseness, and every man was astonished.*”

This circumstance alludes to the choice of Sir Fletcher Norton as Speaker, on the death

of Sir John Cust. Sir Fletcher was strongly opposed by Lord George Sackville.—See parliamentary debates, 1770.

28 May, 1770—note—“ This extravagant resolution appears in the votes of the House ; but, *in the minutes of the committees*, the instances of resolutions contrary to law and truth, or of refusals to acknowledge law and truth when proposed to them, are innumerable.”

Now such instances could only be known to a member ; they never would make a *public exposure* of facts to criminate themselves.

14 Nov. 1770—“ Your conduct [Lord Mansfield] it seems, must be defended in parliament. For what other purpose is your wretched friend, that miserable Serjeant, posted to the House of Commons ? Is it in the abilities of a Mr. Leigh to defend the great Lord Mansfield ? Or is he only punch of the puppet-shew, to speak as he is prompted, by the chief juggler behind the curtain.”

“ This paragraph gagged poor Leigh. I really am concerned for the man, *and wish it were possible to open his mouth. He is a very pretty orator.*”

This was written preparatory to Lord George Sackville's vehement attack on Lord Mansfield, three weeks afterwards.

22 April, 1771—“ To sacrifice a respected

character, and to renounce the esteem of society, requires more than Mr. Wedderburne's resolution ; and though in him it was rather a profession than a desertion of his principles, *yet we have seen him in the House of Commons, overwhelmed with confusion, and almost bereft of his faculties.*"

13 Dec. 1770—"The House of Lords, justly offended at the accuracy and precision, with which a certain noble Duke's oration has been delivered to the public, and concluding that the very words must have been taken down in writing, by some foreign enemy, have determined to preserve the honour of their members, and the credit of their eloquence, by ordering *all* strangers to be carefully excluded. But not to give offence, the exclusion is made general ; their lordships very properly considering that *the members of the House of Commons* are no more fit to be trusted with the debates of a public assembly, than the spies or emissaries of a foreign ambassador, or so many Jesuists in disguise."

This precautionary measure was taken at the time, under a supposition that no one but a member of the House of Commons could possess such ready information on every subject, as was so promptly laid before the public ; indeed, it must strike every reader, that the members of the Upper House were not without their suspicions.

19 Nov. 1770—"A few days ago *I was in a large public company*, where there happened some curious conversation. The Secretary at War [Lord Barrington] was pleased to express himself with unusual simplicity and candour. *He assured us* that, after having carefully considered the subject, he did not know a single general officer, out of near a hundred now in the service, who was in any shape qualified to command the army; and for fear *we* should not believe him, repeated and enforced his assertion five several times. You will allow, sir, that at the eve of a foreign war, this is pretty comfortable intelligence for the nation, especially as it comes from authority. He gave *us* some consolation, however, by assuring *us* that he and General Hervey would take excellent care of the army, and compared himself, not unhappily, to an old woman curing an ague, with the assistance of Doctor Radcliffe."

On reference to Lord Barrington's speech on this occasion, we find language paramount to Junius's declaration, although, in the instance before us, it is treated ironically.

The following Letter says, "*I have never joined* in the several censures which have lately been thrown upon Lord Barrington."

This certainly must allude to *speaking in the House*, as the tenor of the Letters themselves is

one continued strain of satire upon Lord Barington's conduct.

Lord George was sufficiently on his guard at this juncture *not to join* in the general censure of the opposition. See Parliamentary Debates.

Had the writer been merely a looker-on from the gallery, instead of a member, he would have said in the previous paragraph, "he gave *the House* some consolation, however, by assuring *the members*," &c. Junius evidently forgot himself in this, as well as in many other instances.

Aug. 15, 1771—"My vote will hardly recommend him to an increase of his pension, or a seat in the Cabinet."

Oct. 5, 1771—"I willingly accept of a sarcasm from Colonel Barré, or a simile from Mr. Burke; even the silent vote of Mr. Calcraft is worth reckoning in a divison."

Article VIII.—That from the early information Junius obtained on government affairs, it is evident he was connected with some persons in administration.

"By way of intelligence you may inform the public, that Mr. De la Fontaine, *for his secret* services in the Alley, is appointed Barrack-master to the Savoy."—Private Letter, No. 14.

“The facts are all literally true. Mr. Hine’s place is customer at the port of Exeter. Colonel Burgoyne received 4,000*l.* for it. To mend the matter, *the money was raised by contribution*, and the subscribers quartered upon Mr. Hine. Among the rest, one Doctor Brook, a physician at Exeter, has 100*l.* a year out of the salary. I think you might give these particulars in your own way to the public.”—No. 15.

“Lord Mansfield has thrown the ministry into confusion, by *suddenly* resigning the office of Speaker to the House of Lords.”—No. 24.

“You may assure the public that a squadron of ships of the line is ordered to be got ready with all possible expedition for the East Indies. It is to be commanded by Commodore Spry. Without regarding the language of ignorant or interested people, *depend upon the assurance I give you*, that every man in administration looks upon war as inevitable.”—No. 28.

“You may rely upon it, the ministry are sick of prosecutions. *Those against Junius cost the Treasury above six thousand pounds*, and after all they got nothing but disgrace.”—No. 33.

This being *a private item* in the Treasury accounts, no common political writer could have gained the information.

“*They talk of further informations, but they will always hold that language in terrorem.*”—No. 43.

“I fear your friend Jerry Dyson will lose his Irish pension.”—No. 44.

The printer was informed of this before any intelligence could have come over from Ireland, announcing the apprehension to be verified. So that it must have been previously discussed in the council upon Irish affairs.

“The Duke of Grafton has been long labouring to detach Camden.”—No. 47.

“Barrington has *just* appointed a French broker his deputy, for no reason but his relation to Bradshaw. I hear from all quarters, that it is looked upon as a most impudent insult to the army.”—No. 52.

In consequence of this appointment Mr. D'Oyley was dismissed; he afterwards became Lord George's private secretary.—See Life of Cumberland.

May 28, 1771—“When the King was urged to dissolve the present parliament, *you [Welbore Ellis]* advised him to tell his subjects, ‘that he was careful not to assume any of those powers, which the constitution had placed in other hands,’ &c.”

3d April, 1770—“About this time the courtiers talked of nothing but a bill of pains and

penalties against the Lord Mayor and Sheriffs, or impeachment at least. *Little Mannikin Ellis told the King that, if the business were left to his management, he would engage to do wonders.* It was thought very odd that a motion of so much importance should be entrusted to the most contemptible little piece of machinery in the whole kingdom. His honest zeal was however disappointed."

19 Oct. 1768—"If Lord Shelburne's remaining in office constitutes a security of peace, his being suddenly removed must amount to a declaration of war. Now, sir, *the fact is, that his Lordship's removal has been for some weeks in agitation, and is within these few days absolutely determined.* If I were a party writer, the indiscretion of the ministerial advocates would give me as many advantages as even the wretched conduct of the ministry themselves."

This paragraph is directly in unison with the suspicion entertained by Lord Shelburne himself, that Lord George was the author of the letters: and which was one reason, among many others that he gave, for his dissent to his being called up to the House of Lords in 1782.

Lord Shelburne said, "With regard to the person now designed to be created a peer, he called upon the learned adviser of the crown, and asked why? When it was first thought of

to make that person a Secretary of State, those who had held such a strong language of 'kill them, or they will kill you,' and who had declared '*we had passed the Rubicon,*' before any other person knew we were seriously at war with America, had not acted in conformity with their high sounding tone, &c."

15 Aug. 1771—"The very soliloquy of Lord Suffolk before he passed the Rubicon."

Lord Suffolk was promoted, to make room for the Earl of Hillsborough, who was Secretary of State for the American Colonies at the commencement of the war. All the changes in administration were known to Junius, and the public could not possibly have been made acquainted with these different events, but through one who had such remarkable access to immediate channels of information.

Can we wonder then at his extreme caution and his declaration to Mr. Woodfall, No. 41—"I must be more cautious than ever. I am sure I should not survive a discovery three days; or if I did, *they would attain, me by bill.*"

Jan. 21, 1769—"The Duke of Grafton took the office of Secretary of State, *with an engagement* to support the Marquis of Rockingham's administration. He resigned, however, in a little time, *under pretence*, that he could not act without Lord Chatham, nor bear to see Mr.

Wilkes abandoned ; but that under Lord Chatham he would act in any office. This was the signal of Lord Rockingham's dismissal. When Lord Chatham came in, the Duke got possession of the Treasury. Reader, mark the consequence."

Junius here refers to the year 1765, at which period Lord George Sackville was made a member of the Privy Council, and one of the joint Treasurers of the kingdom of Ireland, the only situation to which he had been appointed since his disgrace at Court. Now it is a remarkable circumstance, that a few months after this appointment, when the Duke of Grafton got possession of the Treasury, Lord George Sackville immediately resigned his situation as joint Treasurer of Ireland. What occasioned this circumstance, it may now be difficult to trace, but it is evident there must have been some serious misunderstanding between them.

A few months after this resignation of Lord George Sackville, the Miscellaneous Letters of Junius commence, the first of which portrays, in a clear light, Lord George's resentment and chagrin.

Why should Lord George resign so soon after his new appointment under the Rockingham administration? He had no other emolument left, neither did he hold any place under government, until he was appointed Secretary

of State in 1775. During this interval the letters of Junius were written.

Jan. 21, 1769—"It was pretended that the Earl of Rochford, while Ambassador in France, had quarrelled with the Duke de Choiseuil, and that therefore he was appointed to the Northern department, out of compliment to the French Minister."

September 19, 1769—"Even the callous pride of Lord Egremont was alarmed."

"This man, notwithstanding his pride and Tory principles, had some English stuff in him. Upon an official letter he wrote to the Duke of Bedford, the Duke desired to be recalled, and it was with the utmost difficulty that Lord Bute could appease him."

Here we have four secrets divulged; the feelings of Lord Egremont; the circumstance of his writing *officially* to the Duke of Bedford; the result of that letter; and the interference of Lord Bute on the occasion.

August 22, 1770—"This infamous transaction ought to be explained to the public. Colonel Gisborne was quarter-master general in Ireland. Lord Townshend *persuades him to resign* to a Scotch officer, one Fraser, and gives him the government of Kinsale. Colonel Cunningham was adjutant-general in Ireland. Lord Townshend *offers him a pension*, to induce him

to resign to Luttrell. Cunningham treats the offer with contempt. What's to be done? poor Gisborne must move once more. He accepts of a pension of 500*l.* a year, until a government of greater value shall become vacant. Colonel Cunningham is made Governor of Kinsale; and Luttrell, at last, for whom the whole machinery is put in motion, becomes adjutant-general, and in effect takes the command of the army in Ireland."

This is a military transaction altogether, which would be likely to interest a military man and no one else. Lord George's enmity to the Luttrells was a sufficient cause for exposing the affair. It would make no difference to a lawyer or a clergyman, whether Colonel Gisborne, Colonel Cunningham, or Colonel Luttrell became adjutant-general.

January 30, 1771—"The King's acceptance of the Spanish Ambassador's declaration, is drawn up in barbarous French, and signed by the Earl of Rochford. This diplomatic Lord had spent his life in the study and practice of etiquettes, and is supposed to be a profound master of the ceremonies. I will not insult him by any reference to grammar or common sense. If he were even acquainted with the common forms of his office, I should think him as well qualified for it, as any man in his Majesty's ser-

vice. The reader is requested to observe Lord Rochford's method of authenticating a public instrument—'En foi de quoi, moi soussigné, un des principaux Secretaires d'Etat S. M. B., ai signé la presente de ma signature ordinaire, et icelle fait apposer le cachet de nos armes.'—In three lines there are no less than seven false concords. But the man does not even know the style of his office; if he had known it, he would have said, 'Nous, soussigné Secrétaire d'Etat de S. M. B., avons signé, &c.' ”

This criticism forcibly reminds us of Lord George's manner of inspecting official documents, mentioned by the Earl of Orford; one instance in particular, relative to the failure at Rochfort during Pitt's administration; on which occasion he was one appointed to enquire, how far General Conway was implicated; and he gave it as his opinion, that the General should be tried by a court-martial.

Lord George was a good French scholar, having had an opportunity of obtaining a thorough knowledge of the language when in France with his father Lionel, Duke of Dorset, in the summer of 1738, at which period he might have seen the Jesuitical books burnt in Paris, mentioned by Junius 23d April, 1768.

July 9, 1771—“By an intercepted letter from the Treasury, it appeared that the friends of

Government were to be very active in supporting the ministerial nomination of sheriffs.”

That a letter of this consequence should be intercepted in so large a city as the metropolis of England, is rather curious, but still more so, that it should *happen* to fall into Junius's hands. I should be inclined to think this intelligence might have been obtained without the aid of a letter.

Sufficient instances are enumerated to shew the very early information Junius obtained on confidential subjects, which must have been revealed to him by some friend closely allied to government. As far as Lord George Sackville was concerned, his rank in life, and the circumstance of belonging to his Majesty's Privy Council, might have facilitated such information; independently of which, we have evidence of his applying to his friend, Sir Robert Wilmot, on the subject of the augmentation in Ireland. We may naturally conclude, that if he did so in this instance, he did in others, but this cannot possibly be proved without access to the Wilmot papers. Another person who would be likely to assist him was his friend Colonel Amherst, brother to Sir Jeffery, who held the situations of Groom of the Bed-chamber to the Duke of Gloucester, and Aid-de-camp to the King; during the time of Junius;—who,

in Miscellaneous Letter XLIII., 15 Sept. 1768, appears to have received the following information from that quarter:—

“ Yet Lord Boutetort kissed hands the next morning (Friday), and the first notice Sir Jeffery Amherst received of his Lordship’s appointment, was by an express sent to him that evening by his brother.”

Article IX.—That Junius was a firm friend to Sir Jeffery (afterwards Lord) Amherst.

We need only refer to the Letters themselves to notice how freely the pen of friendship was used by Junius on his behalf. Upwards of fifty pages are taken up in Sir Jeffery Amherst’s cause, concluding with this remarkable prophecy, so literally fulfilled afterwards.

Letter XLIV. 20 Sept. 1761—To the Earl of Hillsborough—

“ Here I shall conclude. You have sent Sir Jeffery Amherst to the plough. You have left him poor in every article of which a false fawning minister could deprive him; but you have left him rich in the esteem, the love, and the veneration of his country. You cannot *now* recall him by any offer of wealth or honours. *Yet I foretell that the time will come*, when you yourself will be the cause of his return. Proceed, my Lord, as you have begun, and you will soon reduce

this country to an extremity, *in which the wisest and best subjects must be called upon, and must be employed.* Till then enjoy your triumph.”

When Lord George became Secretary of State for the American Colonies, Lord Amherst also became a member of the cabinet. Their intimacy has already been noticed.

Article X.—That Junius was a friend to Colonel Cunninghame.

“ TO LORD NORTH.

“ 22 Aug. 1770.

“ MY LORD,

“ Mr. Luttrell’s services were the chief support and ornament of the Duke of Grafton’s administration. The honour of rewarding them was reserved for your Lordship. The Duke, it seems, had contracted an obligation he was ashamed to acknowledge, and unable to acquit. You, my Lord, had no scruples. You accepted the succession with all its incumbrances, and have paid Mr. Luttrell his legacy, at the hazard of ruining the estate.

“ When this accomplished youth declared himself the champion of government, the world was busy in enquiring, what honours or emoluments could be a sufficient recompence, to a young man of his rank and fortune, for submit-

ting to mark his entrance into life with the universal contempt and detestation of his country. His noble father had not been so precipitate : to vacate his seat in Parliament ; to intrude upon a country in which he had no interest or connexion ; to possess himself of another man's right ; and to maintain it in defiance of public shame, as well as justice, bespoke a degree of zeal, or of depravity, which all the favour of a pious prince could hardly requite. I protest, my Lord, there is in this young man's conduct, a strain of prostitution, which, for its singularity, I cannot but admire. He has discovered a new line in the human character ; he has degraded even the name of Luttrell, and gratified his father's most sanguine expectations.

“ The Duke of Grafton, with every possible disposition to patronize this kind of merit, was contented with pronouncing Colonel Luttrell's panegyric. The gallant spirit, the disinterested zeal of the young adventurer, were echoed through the House of Lords. His Grace repeatedly pledged himself to the House, as an evidence of the purity of his friend Mr. Luttrell's intentions, that he had engaged without any prospect of personal benefit, and that the idea of compensation would mortally offend him. The noble Duke could hardly be in earnest ; but he had lately quitted his employment, and

began to think it necessary to take some care of his reputation. At that very moment the Irish negotiation was probably begun. Come forward, thou worthy representative of Lord Bute, and tell this insulted country, who advised the King to appoint Mr. Luttrell *Adjutant-General* to the army in Ireland. By what management was Colonel Cunningham prevailed on to resign his employment, and the obsequious Gisborne to accept of a pension for the government of Kinsale? Was it an original stipulation with the Princess of Wales, or does he owe his preferment to your Lordship's partiality, or to the Duke of Bedford's friendship? My Lord, though it may not be possible to trace this measure to its source, we can follow the stream, and warn the country of its approaching destruction. The English nation must be roused and put upon its guard.

“Mr. Luttrell has already shewn us how far he may be trusted, whenever an open attack is to be made upon the liberties of this country. I do not doubt that there is a deliberate plan formed. Your Lordship best knows by whom; the corruption of the legislative body on this side—a military force on the other—and then, *Farewell to England!* It is impossible that any minister shall dare to advise the King to place such a man as Luttrell in the confidential post of *Adjutant-General*, if there were not some secret

purpose in view, which only such a man as Luttrell is fit to promote. The insult offered to the army in general, is as gross as the outrage intended to the people of England. What! Lieutenant-Colonel Luttrell, Adjutant-General of an army of sixteen thousand men! One would think his Majesty's campaigns at Blackheath and Wimbledon might have taught him better. I cannot help wishing General Harvey joy of a colleague, who does so much honour to the employments.

“ But, my Lord, this measure is too daring to pass unnoticed, too dangerous to be received with indifference or submission. You shall not have time to new-model the Irish army. They will not submit to be garbled by Colonel Luttrell. As a mischief to the English Constitution (for he is not worth the name of an enemy), they already detest him. As a boy, impudently thrust over their heads, they will receive him with indignation and contempt.

“ As for you, my Lord, who, perhaps, are no more than the blind unhappy instrument of Lord Bute and Her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales, be assured, that you shall be called upon to answer for the advice which has been given, and either discover your accomplices, or fall a sacrifice to their security.—JUNIUS.”—Letter:

To point out this *military transaction* in as clear a light as possible, Junius makes an addition of a note, to shew that his friend Colonel Cunninghame considered himself degraded by the offer that was made him. He adds :

“ This infamous transaction ought to be explained to the public. Colonel Gisborne was quarter-master-general in Ireland. Lord Townshend persuades him to resign to a Scotch officer, one Fraser, and gives him the government of Kinsale. *Colonel Cunninghame was adjutant-general in Ireland.* Lord Townshend offers him a pension, to induce him to resign to Luttrell. Cunninghame treats the offer with contempt. What's to be done ? Poor Gisborne must move once more. He accepts of a pension of 500*l.* a-year, until a government of greater value shall become vacant. Colonel Cunninghame is made governor of Kinsale ; and Luttrell, at last, for whom the whole machinery is put in motion, becomes adjutant-general, and in effect takes the command of the army in Ireland.”

Colonel Cunninghame was an intimate friend of Lord George Sackville as early as the year 1746. The acquaintance commenced during the Rebellion in Scotland, at which period Cunninghame joined Lord George's regiment. In a private letter from Perth, to his friend Major

Younge, inserted in his Lordship's biography, he therein says—

“ All I pray for is, that I may never have occasion any more to visit those Northern Hills, for I think nothing but a Rebellion can ever call me there again. An acquaintance of yours bears me company in this place, Cunninghame is his name ; if that is not sufficient to call him to your remembrance, il a une sœur au Chateau de Stirling qui n'est pas laide. He expects by every post to hear that he is in my regiment, and, I believe, you will think he is no bad recruit.”

After the campaign in Scotland had terminated, and the troops returned home, they continued on intimate terms. It is, therefore, reasonable to conclude that Cunninghame had written to Lord George from Ireland, apprising him of the circumstance. In his character of Junius, he immediately espouses his friend's cause against the ambition and injustice of Colonel Luttrell. Luttrell having quarrelled with Lord George, gave him a more decided opportunity of expressing his resentment. The whole letter is on military topics, irrelevant from the politics of the day, and only interested such as were connected with the army.—It had so instantaneous an effect upon the ministry, that Colonel Luttrell was obliged to resign a few days after-

wards, and Colonel Cunninghame, the friend of Junius, was again reinstated.

Article XI.—That Junius was an admirer of Mr. Grenville.

21 Jan. 1760—“ A series of inconstant measures had alienated the colonies from their duty as subjects, and from their natural affection to their common country. When Mr. Grenville was placed at the head of the treasury, he felt the impossibility of Great Britain’s supporting such an establishment as her former successes had made indispensable, and at the same time of giving any sensible relief to foreign trade, and to the weight of the public debt. He thought it equitable that those parts of the Empire, which had benefited most by the expences of the war, should contribute something to the expences of the peace, and he had no doubt of the constitutional right vested in Parliament to raise that contribution. *But, unfortunately for his country, Mr. Grenville was, at any rate, to be distressed, because he was minister.*”

6 August, 1768—Junius applauds Mr. Grenville for enforcing the stamp act in America, and concludes by saying:—

“Your correspondent confesses that Mr. Grenville is still respectable; yet he warns the friends of that gentleman not to provoke him,

lest he should tell them what they may not like to hear. These are but words. He means as little when he threatens, as when he condescends to applaud. Let us meet upon the fair ground of truth, and if he finds *one* vulnerable part in Mr. Grenville's character, let him fix his poisoned arrow there."

15 Dec. 1768—"While parliament preserves its constitutional authority, you will preserve yours; as long as there is a real representation of the people, you will be heard in that great assembly with attention, deference, and respect, and if, fatally for England, the designs of the present ministry should at last succeed, you will have the consolation to reflect that your voice was heard, until the voice of truth and reason was drowned in the din of arms; and that your influence in parliament was irresistible until every question was decided by the sword."

I have already mentioned Lord George Sackville's friendship for Sir Jeffery Amherst, and his admiration of Mr. Grenville as a statesman, from a speech Lord George made in the House of Commons, shortly after Mr. Grenville's decease, wherein he passed a fine eulogium on his character.

¹Article XII.—That Junius was a strong advocate for the stamp act in America.

Junius—19 Dec. 1767—“ It would be to no purpose at present to renew a discussion of the merits of the stamp act, though *I am convinced* that even the people who were most clamorous against it either never understood, or wilfully misrepresented every part of it. But it is truly astonishing, that a great number of people should have so little foreseen the inevitable consequence of repealing it, and particularly that the trading part of the city should have conceived, that a compliance which acknowledged the rod to be in the hands of the Americans, could ever induce them to surrender it. They must have been rather weaker than ourselves, if they ever paid their debts, when they saw plainly that, by withholding them, they kept us in subjection. In the natural course of things the debtor should be at the mercy of his creditor, rather than a tyrant over him; but it seems that for these three years past, where ever America hath been concerned, every argument of reason, every rule of law, and every claim of nature, has been despised or reversed. We have not even a tolerable excuse for our folly. The punishment has followed close upon it; and that it must be so, was as evident to common sense as probable in prospect, as it is now certain in experience. There was indeed one man [Mr. Grenville] who wisely foresaw every circum-

stance which has since happened, and who, with a patriot's spirit, opposed himself to the torrent. He told us, that, if we thought the loss of outstanding debts, and of our American trade, a mischief of the first magnitude, such an injudicious compliance with the terms dictated by the colonies, was the way to make it sure and unavoidable. It was *ne moriari mori*. We see the prophecy verified in every particular, and *if this great and good man* was mistaken in any one instance, it was, perhaps, that he did not expect his predictions to be fulfilled so soon as they have been."

Let us hear what Lord George Sackville has to say upon the subject:—

March 7, 1774—In the House of Commons, Lord George in reply to Mr. Burke said, "The honourable gentleman who spoke last, has taken great pains to expose the conduct of different administrations, and to extol those who advised the repeal of the stamp act. For my part, however great the abilities and good intentions of those gentlemen might have been, *I was of opinion that it should not be repealed, and voted accordingly*. It is now contended, that that measure produced the desired effect, and that on its passing, every thing was peace and tranquillity. I know the contrary was the case, and we had evidence at your bar, which proved, that

the Americans were totally displeased, because in the preamble to the repeal, we asserted our right to enact laws of sufficient force and authority to bind them. *I am on the whole fully convinced, that the present situation of affairs in that country, would have never been; and that the people there, must and would have returned to their obedience, if the stamp act had not been unfortunately repealed.*—Cobbett's Parliamentary Debates.

Article XIII.—That Junius was in favour of repealing the duty on tea in America.

“Since the repeal of the stamp act, I know of no acts tending to tax the Americans, except that which creates the tea duty; and even that can hardly be called internal. *Yet it ought to be repealed, as an impolitic act, not as an oppressive one. It preserves the contention between the mother country and the colonies, when every thing worth contending for is in reality given up.*”—Private Letter to Mr. Wilkes, 7 Sept. 1771.

January 26, 1775.—Lord George Germain said, “If the Americans would petition for their repeal, he would stretch forth the first hand to present it; but, on the contrary, if they claimed such a repeal as a right, thereby disputing the authority of the mother country,

which no reasonable man ever called in question, he wished it might be enforced with a Roman severity.”

Article XIV.—That Junius was an advocate for triennial parliaments.

Sept. 7, 1771—“ I am satisfied that, with a triennial parliament, and without it all other provisions are nugatory, Mr. Grenville’s Bill is, or may be made, a sufficient guard against any gross, or flagrant offences in this way.”

“ Whenever the question shall be seriously agitated, I will endeavour (and if I live, will assuredly attempt it) to convince the English nation by arguments, to my understanding unanswerable, that they ought to insist upon a *triennial*, and banish the idea of an annual parliament.”

In his dedication, he also says :—“ You cannot but conclude, without the possibility of a doubt, that long parliaments are the foundation of an undue influence of the crown.”

Alderman Sawbridge’s motion came on for many years successively.

Feb. 17, 1772—Junius says—“ I could not have conceived it possible, that you could protract the publication so long. At this time, particularly before Mr. Sawbridge’s motion (in favour of triennial parliaments), it would have

been of singular use.”—Private Letter to Mr. Woodfall, No. 55.

Feb. 29, 1772—“ I am very glad to see that the Book will be out before Mr. Sawbridge’s motion.”—No. 57.

On the 4th of March 1772, Mr. Sawbridge’s motion came on. The Alderman made a long speech on that occasion, which, it is much to be regretted, is the only one that is reported. The motion was lost by a large majority. I have taken considerable pains in referring to newspapers of that date, hoping I should be able to procure the speeches of other members; but to no effect. They were not regularly printed as in the present day. I had nearly given up my research as useless, of endeavouring to obtain Lord George’s opinion, when, casting my eye over the papers of the ensuing week (March 10, 1772, Daily Advertiser), I found the following paragraph.—“ Through the kindness of one of our correspondents, we have been favoured with a few of the names who voted in favour of Mr. Alderman Sawbridge’s motion.” In this short catalogue is the name of *Lord George Sackville*, which not only shews that he was in the House that night, but that his opinion was in unison with that expressed by Junius.

Article XV.—That Junius considered the

impeachment of Lord Mansfield as indispensable.

Private Letter to Mr. Wilkes, No. 66 (relative to the proceedings of the Bill of Rights' Society), Junius observes—"The seventh article is also very proper and necessary. The impeachment of Lord Mansfield, upon his own paper, is indispensable. Yet suffer me to guard you against the seducing idea of concurring in any vote, or encouraging any bill, which may pretend to ascertain, while in reality it limits, the constitutional powers of juries. I would have their right to return a general verdict in all cases whatsoever, considered as a part of the constitution, fundamental, sacred, and no more questionable by the legislature, than whether the government of the country should be by King, Lords, and Commons."

Mr. Woodfall's trial for printing and publishing Junius's Letter to the King took place June 13, 1770, before Lord Mansfield. Junius's Letter to Lord Mansfield was written 14 Nov. 1770.

Serjeant Glynn brought forward his motion in the House of Commons 6 Dec. 1770, for a Committee to enquire into the administration of Criminal Justice; upon which Lord George, in a most eloquent speech, delivered his opinions as follows:—

“ Consider, gentlemen, what will be the consequence of refusing this demand, this debt, which you owe to the anxious expectation of the public. The people, seeing *his* avowed defenders so loth to bring him forth on the public stage, and to make him plead his cause before their tribunal, will naturally conclude, that he could not bear the light, because his deeds were evil ; and that, therefore, you judged it advisable to screen him behind the curtain of a majority. Though his conduct was never questioned in Parliament, *mark how he is every day, and every hour, pointed out in print and conversation, as a perverter of the law, and an enemy of the constitution.* No epithet is too bad for him. Now, he is the subtile Scroggs, now, the arbitrary Jeffries. All the records of our courts of law, and all the monuments of our lawyers, are ransacked, in order to find sufficiently odious names by which he may be christened. The libellous and virulent spirit of the times has overleaped all the barriers of law, order, and decorum. The judges are no longer revered, and the laws have lost all their salutary terrors. Juries will not convict petty delinquents, when they suspect *grand criminals go unpunished.* Hence libels and lampoons, audacious beyond the example of all other times ; libels, in comparison of which, the North Briton, once deem-

ed the ne plus ultra of sedition, is perfect innocence and simplicity. The sacred number forty-five, formerly the idol of the multitude, is eclipsed by the superior venom of every day's defamation: all its magical and talismanic powers are lost and absorbed in the general deluge of scandal which pours from the press. When matters are thus circumstanced, when the judges in general, and *Lord Mansfield in particular*, are there hung out to public scorn and detestation, now that libellers receive no countenance from men high in power, and in the public esteem; what will be the consequence when it is publicly known, that they have been arraigned, and that their friends quashed the enquiry, which it was proposed to make upon their conduct? The consequence is more easily conceived than expressed. *I foresee* that the imps of the press, the sons of ink, and the printers' devils, will be all in motion, and they will spare you as little as they will the judges.

“ Like the two thieves in the Gospel, both will be hung up and gibbeted, with the law crucified between you, for the entertainment of coffee-house politicians, greasy carmen, and porters, and barbers, in tippling houses and night cellars. I cannot help thinking that it is the wish of Lord Mansfield himself to have his conduct examined, nay, I collect as much from

the language of a gentleman, who may be supposed to know his sentiments. What foundation then is there for obstructing the enquiry? None at all. It is a pleasure to me to see my noble friend discovering such symptoms of conscious innocence. His ideas perfectly coincide with my own. I would never oppose the minutest scrutiny into my behaviour. However much condemned by the envy or malice of enemies, I would at least show that I stood acquitted in my own mind. *Qui fugit judicium, ipso teste, reus est.*"

I consider this to be one of the most extraordinary speeches ever delivered in the House of Commons. A vein of satire and invective runs throughout the whole, under the mask of friendship for Lord Mansfield. Would any one, I ask, who has any *real* feeling for another, place his noble friend in the degraded station of a thief in the gospel, or gibbet him for the amusement of the vulgar! Impossible. Besides it is well known, that the intimacy which subsisted between them, previous to Lord George's trial, ceased after that event; Lord Mansfield's opinion having proved to be erroneous. Lord George himself confessed to the King some years afterwards, that Lord Walsingham and Lord Loughborough became his legal friends by preference. There is also ample tes-

timony on the face of the speech to prove that no intimacy subsisted between them at this period, from Lord George's avowal, that "it was from the language of a gentleman who might be supposed to know his sentiments," that he considered Lord Mansfield wished his conduct to be inquired into. Had Lord Mansfield's conduct been generally considered so reprehensible, without a doubt other members would have coincided in opinion as to the propriety of an enquiry.

It is also a curious circumstance, that in the circle of Lord George's acquaintance, the enemies of Lord Mansfield should so preponderate. "*Mark,*" says he, "*how he is every day and every hour pointed out in conversation.*"

Serjeant Glynn's motion was not to stigmatize the name of any particular judge, but merely to nominate a committee, "to inquire into the administration of criminal justice."

Can we wonder, after reading this speech, at the proposition of a noble Earl, to have Lord George expelled the House? They were fearful of bringing the case forward, lest they should fail in the attempt; or in the event of their succeeding, Lord Shelburne observed, they could not foresee the possibility of keeping him out, as the family were possessed of

boroughs which could return him over and over again. It is evident also from an attentive perusal of Junius, that the writer prepared himself for such an event, by the infinite pains he took to investigate the cases of Walpole, Wilkes, and Wollaston.

In allusion to the speech just quoted, Junius observes :—

13 Dec. 1770—"Let it be known to posterity, that when Lord Mansfield was attacked with so much vehemence in the House of Commons, on Thursday the 6th instant, not one of the Ministry said a word in his defence."

Article XVI.—That from the manner in which Junius upholds rotten boroughs, it is highly probable they either constituted part of his property, or that he was in some way connected with them.

Sept. 7, 1771—Private Letter to Mr. Wilkes—

"As to cutting away the rotten boroughs, I am as much offended as any man at seeing so many of them under the direct influence of the crown, or at the disposal of private persons, yet I own I have both doubts and apprehensions, in regard to the remedy you propose. I shall be charged, perhaps, with an unusual want of political intrepidity, when I honestly confess to you, that I am startled at the idea of

so extensive an amputation. In the first place, I question the power *de jure* of the legislature to disfranchise a number of boroughs upon the general ground of improving the constitution.

“There cannot be a doctrine more fatal to the liberty and property we are contending for, than that which confounds the idea of a supreme and an arbitrary legislature. I need not point out to you the fatal purposes to which it has been and may be applied. If we are sincere on the political creed we profess, there are many things which we ought to affirm, cannot be done by King, Lords or Commons. Among these I reckon the disfranchising a borough with a general view to improvement. I consider it as equivalent to robbing the parties concerned of the freehold of their birth-right. I say, that although this birth-right may be forfeited, or the exercise of it suspended in particular cases, it cannot be taken away by a general law, for any real or pretended purpose of improving the constitution. I believe there is no power in this country to make such a law.”

The answer to this article is very short, and will be noticed in a summary of his Lordship's life.

It is sufficient to observe here, that Lord George sat in parliament in 1775, for his own borough of East Grinstead.

Article XVII.—That Junius considered a strict regard should be paid to the public expenditure, that the national debt might not be increased.

Sept. 7, 1771—The House of Commons are indeed too ready in granting large sums under the head of extraordinaries incurred, and not provided for. But the accounts lie before them; it is their own fault if they do not examine them. The manner in which the late debt upon the civil list was pretended to be incurred, and really paid, demands a particular examination. Never was there a more impudent outrage offered to a patient people.”

21 Jan. 1769—“ If his plan for the service of the current year be not irrevocably fixed on, let me warn him to think seriously of consequences before he ventures to increase the public debt. Outraged and oppressed as we are, this nation will not bear, after a six years’ peace, to see new millions borrowed, without an eventual diminution of debt, or reduction of interest.”

The same opinion was maintained by Lord George in the House of Commons, particularly in the year 1764, towards the close of the German War. “ In an eloquent speech he pointed out the difference in the expence of Queen Anne’s War and the present; that though in the former we had near 180,000 troops employed

on the Continent, and in the present not above half the number, yet the expence now was much greater than at that time—which he was confident must be owing to the mismanagement of the German War. He was of opinion that the expences the nation had already borne were so great, it was impossible to obtain any further supplies; that, therefore, he feared he should see the time, when we should come to a full stop for want of money to carry on the war. *That he bled to see his country in such distressed circumstances, and concluded, with hoping that he might never live to see the day, when we, as a powerful nation, should be obliged to ask a favour of those who ought to beg it of us.*”

The national debt at that time was about one hundred and fifty millions. What would he say now?

Article XVIII.—That Junius was against disbanding the army, although a firm friend to the marching regiments. He was also in favour of impressing seamen.

Private Letter to Mr. Wilkes, No. 66., 7 Sept. 1771—“As for refusing to vote the army or navy, I hope we shall never be mad enough to try an experiment every way so hazardous.”

Letter to the King, Dec. 19, 1769.—“You take the sense of the army from the conduct of

the guards, with the same justice with which you collect the sense of the people from the representations of the ministry. *Your marching regiments*, Sir, will not make the guards their example, either as soldiers or subjects. They feel and resent, as they ought to do, that invariable distinguishing favour with which the guards are treated; while those *gallant troops*, by whom every hazardous, every laborious service is performed, are left to perish in garrisons abroad, or pine in quarters at home, neglected and forgotten. If they had no great sense of the original duty they owe their country, their resentment would operate like patriotism, and leave your cause to be defended by those to whom you have lavished the rewards and honours of their profession. The prætorian bands, enervated and debauched as they were, had still strength enough to awe the Roman populace; but when the distant legions took the alarm, they marched to Rome and gave away the Empire."

"The number of commissioned officers in the guards are to the marching regiments as one to eleven; the number of regiments given to the guards, compared with those given to the line, is about three to one, at a moderate computation; consequently the partiality in favour of the guards is as thirty-three to one. So much

for the officers. *The private men have fourpence a day to subsist on, and five hundred lashes if they desert. Under this punishment they frequently expire. With these encouragements, it is supposed they may be depended upon, whenever a certain person thinks it necessary to butcher his fellow subjects.*"

The army at all times appears to have attracted the attention of Junius. No event or internal regulation passes unobserved. Who but a military character would notice the distinction between the guards and the marching regiments? But this was an interesting topic with Lord George. He detested the guards, was disgusted with their conduct ever after his trial, and was jealous of their Sovereign's favour. As Lord Orford observes, "the horse-guards was an eye-sore every time he walked that way."

Junius bestows some pages upon a squabble among their officers, and half confesses that it was in consequence of personal malice to three of them: one of whom, he owned to Mr. Woodfall, he was willing to spare. No. 11, he says—
"The only thing that hinders my pushing the subject of my last letter, is really the fear of ruining that poor devil, Gansel."

October 18, 1771—To Mr. Wilkes. "You talk of disbanding the army with wonderful ease

and indifference. If a wiser man held such language, I should be apt to suspect his sincerity."

October 5, 1771—" I too have a claim to the candid interpretation of my country, when I acknowledge an involuntary compulsive assent to one very unpopular opinion. I lament the unhappy necessity, whenever it arises, of providing for the safety of the state, by a temporary invasion of the personal liberty of the subject. Would to God it were practicable to reconcile these important objects, in every possible situation of public affairs! I regard the legal liberty of the meanest man in Britain, as much as my own, and would defend it with the same zeal. I know we must stand or fall together. But I never can doubt, that the community has a right to command, as well as to purchase the service of its members. I see that right founded originally upon a necessity, which supersedes all argument. I see it established by usage immemorial, and admitted by more than a tacit assent of the legislature. I conclude there is no remedy, in the nature of things, for the grievance complained of; for if there were, it must long since have been redressed. Though numberless opportunities have presented themselves, highly favourable to public liberty, no successful attempt has ever been made for the relief of the

subject in this article. Yet it has been felt and complained of ever since England had a navy."

Dec. 9, 1772—A motion was made in the House of Commons to raise ten thousand men to send against the Caribbs, upon which Lord George rose and said, "I am astonished to hear an honourable gentleman complain that the planters are not sufficiently protected. Before this expedition they had six battalions; and will any gentleman pretend to say that six battalions are not enough for them? I have authority to assert, that the whole number of the Caribbs does not amount to five hundred men, yet we are sending regiment after regiment to sacrifice, hunt down, and destroy those unfortunate people! I never was in that country, but the climate, I am told, is exceedingly bad. I am told, that if our men are exposed one night to the weather, they will perish. One campaign would inevitably destroy our troops, and let me tell you, sir, that as men are so scarce, we should not be so lavish of them. We already find a great difficulty in recruiting; our regiments cannot be completed on account of the various emigrations, and the averseness which prevails against the service throughout the kingdom. I recollect a circumstance that happened to one of our ships of war (the Phœ-

nix) on her arrival at St. Vincent's: the captain was civilly invited on shore by the governor; the boat that carried him on shore had seven hands, and out of the seven, six returned on board sick, and died. After that, an officer and nine men went on shore to guard the water casks, and seven of these died. Such, sir, is the climate that we are sending our troops to. The two regiments which the noble Lord says are sent from North America have tents; but those tents cannot preserve the men from excessive heat and damps; and we are destroying our men, without a certainty of being able to recruit them. Men are so scarce from the continual drain of the army, navy, and colonization, that I am assured we shall soon, unless some remedy is adopted, be in a miserable situation. *Besides, what encouragement have men to enter into the service? to live, pardon me, to starve upon sixpence a day!* The soldier's pay since the first institution of an army has never been raised: the officer's has repeatedly, *but the soldier's never.* No, sir, in the famous Tyrone rebellion in Ireland, when the Spaniards landed in that country, the soldiers had sixpence a day, and now, notwithstanding the great difference in the two periods, and dearness of provisions, they have no more. Indeed, sir, I am astonished how they live; and

considering our situation, I think we ought to be extremely cautious how we employ our troops; and I hope, as the noble Lord assures us they can, that the Secretary of State will furnish those cogent reasons, which would render such a slaughter of men and waste of public money necessary in time of peace."

Here we have the same care extended toward the private soldiers, as is manifested by Junius, and the same argument maintained against the men being unwilling to act on account of the smallness of their pay. Yet, notwithstanding this general feeling toward the private soldiers, we shall find, in the ensuing speech*, cogent reasons for not disbanding the army, or placing them on the same footing with other classes of his Majesty's subjects; expediency being urged as a plea for superseding every minor consideration. It also tends to convince us that although the object of Junius might have been to gratify private resentment, yet when his *opinions* are thoroughly examined, we are convinced that he wrote from principle, and that in politics he was not a republican.

In a Debate in the House of Commons on a bill for limiting the time for soldiers to serve in the army, Lord George Sackville said, "Whether the dangers and inconveniences that may arise from

* His first in the House of Commons.

the passing of this bill be real or imaginary, is a question that may certainly admit of some dispute: but there is a maxim that never was yet disputed, and that is the maxim often repeated by our best lawyers and greatest patriots—‘*Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari*’; for it has always been allowed, that no new law ought to be introduced, unless there appear to be a very manifest defect in the old, and a defect which is attended with some public inconvenience of a very pernicious nature. To imagine that any human regulation can be so perfect as to be attended by no inconveniences, is surely chimerical; and human foresight is so short, that it is impossible for us to see all the inconveniences which an alteration of any standing law may be attended with. We should not therefore fly to alterations and what we may call amendments, upon every little inconvenience that may arise; for if we did, we should every session be altering the whole body of our laws; and very probably, like the tinkers, where we mended one hole, we should make two: where we removed an old inconvenience, we should introduce two new ones, which has so often been the case, that in a conversation about mending the law, a very learned and experienced judge now deceased, gave it as his opinion, that the best way to amend the law, would be to repeal all the laws that had been made for one hundred

years past. Now, sir, before we agree to the passing of this bill into a law, I should be glad to know what inconvenience there is, either of a public or a private nature, in detaining a listed soldier in the service, *until his Majesty should think fit to disband the regiment*, or his officer should think fit to grant him his discharge? As to the public, I am sure it is, instead of an inconvenience, a very signal advantage; for in case of a war, it is surely better for the public to be served by veterans, or well disciplined soldiers, than by men newly listed, and quite ignorant of any sort of military discipline. And as to private men, I shall grant it is an inconvenience for a man to be bound to the performance of any contract he makes: but for that reason, I hope you would not make a law for rendering all contracts made, or to be made, invalid, unless both parties are willing to perform the same; for such a law would put an end to all commerce and intercourse among mankind, and consequently would be a greater inconvenience to every private man, than that which arises from the law as it stands at present: and I can see no reason why a listed soldier should not be bound to the performance of the contract he enters into by listing, as well as to that of any other contract he makes; for as the law now stands, no one can say he is drawn

into it by his own rashness, or by any trick in the person that lists him, because he has four days to consider and avoid what he has done, which is more than is allowed with regard to any other contract, not excepting that of marriage, which is a contract for life, as well as that of listing for a soldier. The bill now before us cannot therefore be founded upon any known inconvenience in the law military, as it now stands, but must rest wholly upon the advantages expected from it; and there is a very strong argument from experience, against our having any imputation of that kind; for if giving our soldiers a right to demand their discharge after ten years' service, could make recruiting easier, or increase the number of disciplined men in the kingdom, surely the giving them a right to demand their discharge after three years' service, would have a much greater effect in both these respects; yet I never heard that the law made for the purpose, after the peace of Utrecht, was attended with any of those advantages in the least degree. From hence, I think, I am well founded in supposing, that as to both these advantages, the bill would have no effect at all; and as far as I can recollect, these two are the only advantages which the promoters of this bill expect from it. But besides being founded upon experience, my supposition is likewise

founded upon the nature of mankind ; for what is it that induces a man to enlist in the army ? It is generally either his natural disposition, or some misfortune he has met with in his place of birth or residence ; and let it be which of them you will, the same cause that made him enlist, will make him continue in the army as long as he can, unless he meets with some extraordinary good fortune, such as a rich wife, large legacy, or the like ; so that even this bill passed into law, as it would produce no alteration in the nature of mankind, recruiting would remain as difficult and expensive as it is now. Few of those once listed, would ever demand their discharge, or make room for others to enlist, as long as there appeared no likelihood of a war ; consequently we should never, by such a bill as this, have more disciplined men in the kingdom than we have at present.

“ I therefore think it evident, that this bill, should it be passed into a law, could produce no one good effect ; but might, nay, I think it would certainly produce several bad effects ; for either the colonel of every regiment must dismiss every man in his regiment as soon as his time of service was expired, or he could never depend, so much as for one day, upon having his regiment complete ; and the soldiers would be every day changing from regiment to regi-

ment, or from company to company. I do not say they would leave the army ; but whenever a soldier, whose time was expired, took a dislike to his captain, he would demand his discharge, go a rioting for a few days, and then enlist in another company, perhaps, of the same regiment. And if the soldiers of a regiment took a fancy that their major or adjutant was a little too severe, all such of them as had served out the time allotted by law, would demand their discharge and enlist in other regiments ; nor can we suppose, that the officers of other regiments, who wanted recruits, would refuse to receive them ; for officers will always choose to have a disciplined, rather than an undisciplined man, because it saves them the trouble of teaching them their exercise ; and very probably, too, they might always have them at a cheaper rate than first recruits.

“ What a confusion this would occasion in our musters ! what a nonplus a colonel might be put to, when his regiment was just going to be reviewed, perhaps by his Sovereign, may easily be imagined ; and this, I am sure, cannot be said to be a chimerical apprehension. Then, sir, with regard to the cloathing, can we suppose that any soldier entitled to his discharge, would demand it with old regimentals upon his back ? No, sir, we may rest assured, that he would

wait till the regiment was new cloathed, and when he had got his new cloathes on, he would then demand his discharge; and thus the colonel might be put to the expense, not only of re-eruiting, but of new cloathing the greater part of his regiments the second time.

“With regard to the changing of quarters too, this bill, if passed into a law, would be attended with an unavoidable inconvenience; for every soldier, entitled to his discharge, would certainly demand it, if he did not like the quarters the regiment was ordered to; and we may suppose, that no such soldier would ever go to Ireland, in case any regiment should be ordered thither; nor would many of the soldiers in the regiments now there, ever leave that country, in case of their being entitled to their discharge, at the time of the regiment's being ordered home. And as to Gibraltar, Port-Mahon, and the Plantations, we could never send any regiment to any of those places, or do justice to the regiments now there, by calling them home, in their turn, to their native land; for if a regiment was ordered to any of those places, I do not think there is a doubt to be made, but that every soldier in the regiment entitled to his discharge would demand it, probably just when the regiment was going to embark, so that the colonel could not have time to recruit, nor have it in his power

to carry a complete regiment thither, any other way than by giving such a premium to every soldier as he pleased to demand, for his agreeing to go along with him; and such demands, I believe, very few colonels would be able to comply with.

“ These, sir, are some of the inconveniences which I now foresee must necessarily arise from this bill, if passed into a law, and many others might ensue, which none of us at present can foresee; but those I have mentioned are, I think, sufficient for inducing every gentleman to be against this bill, who has a regard for the safety of his country, and thinks it cannot be secured without keeping on foot a number of regular troops.

“ I should be as fond as any gentleman in this House of propagating military discipline, and a martial spirit among all ranks of men in this kingdom, and I would most readily agree to any regulation which had the least appearance of being effectual for that purpose, but the bill now before us, has not so much as the appearance of producing any such effect; for no man of any tolerable circumstances in life will deliberately enlist as a common soldier in the army, when he knows, that if he once enlists, he must remain in the army for ten years, unless his officer shall within that time think fit to grant

him a discharge. Ten years, sir, is too great a part of human life for any man to continue in the army, merely for the sake of making himself master of military discipline; and if you should shorten this term of necessary service, it would add weight to every inconvenience I have mentioned.

“ I will go further, sir: I will say, that if you should shorten the time, it might endanger the present establishment. We know, and I am sorry to say, that we have many great families disaffected to our present happy establishment, especially in the North, and among the Highlands of Scotland. They have a commanding influence over all those of their clan, and all the farms within their estates; they would prevail with, or rather command, every young fellow, whose father had any dependence upon them, to enlist and serve his time in the army; and by this means, they might provide themselves with a great number of disciplined soldiers, *to be employed for overturning our present establishment*, as soon as an opportunity offered. It is well known that the disaffected Chiefs in the Highlands of Scotland made use of the independent companies kept up in that country for this very purpose; and since the breaking of those companies, they have made use of the Scottish regiments in the Dutch service for the same

purpose. It was this that made the late Rebellion so formidable, and at first so successful. That army of rebels was not made up of shepherds, or fellows just taken from the plough, as it was represented through ignorance or design by the friends to the government here: it was chiefly composed of disciplined soldiers, and commanded by noblemen and gentlemen of rank and courage, though, I believe, of no great fortune; and if this bill should pass into a law, we may soon expect to hear of such another army appearing in favour of the Pretender.

“ This, I say, sir, is a danger which may justly be apprehended even from the bill, should it pass into a law; and if the time of service in the army were to be shortened, this danger would become more certain and more imminent. I shall grant there is some danger in our not having any disciplined men in the kingdom, but such as are in our standing army, and subject to military law, and I wish with all my heart it were otherwise; but whilst we have a superiority at sea, it is, I think, hardly possible for a foreign enemy to invade us with a number of regular troops superior to those we may now meet them with, should they have the good fortune, or rather, I should say, the bad fortune, to land in this island; and whilst our army is commanded by gentlemen of rank, and gentle-

men whose property is of much greater value than any thing they can expect from their service in the army, I think we may depend upon it, that an army so commanded will never support a prince or minister in any way for the establishment of arbitrary power, which would of course render every man's property precarious.

“ Even supposing that either this foreign or this domestic danger were, in our present circumstances, to be justly apprehended, I have shewn that neither the one nor the other could be rendered less to be apprehended by the passing this bill; on the contrary, if it added to the number of disciplined men not retained in the army, it would only be among such as would be ready to take up arms against us upon any invasion; and it would load the officers with such an expence, and expose them to so many inconveniences, that no gentleman of an easy fortune would ever accept of a commission: therefore, though I should willingly agree to any bill I thought effectual for propagating military discipline, and a warlike spirit among all ranks of men in this island, I cannot give my consent to the passing of the bill into a law, and consequently must give my negative to the question.”

In this speech Lord George takes occasion, totally unconnected with the subject, to intro-

duce his opinion of the treachery of the Scotch, which must forcibly remind the reader, of Junius's opinion of that nation, in his celebrated Letter to the King.

Article XIX.—That Junius must have had an antipathy to Sir Fletcher Norton, the Speaker of the House of Commons, from the contempt with which he speaks of him.

28 May, 1770—"The Speaker, being young in office, began with pretending ignorance, and ended with deciding for the ministry. We were not surprised at the decision; but he hesitated and blushed at his own baseness, and every man was astonished."

"When the King first made it a measure of his government to destroy Mr. Wilkes, and when for this purpose it was necessary to run down privilege, Sir Fletcher Norton, with his usual prostituted effrontery, assured the House of Commons, that he should regard one of their votes, no more than a resolution of so many drunken porters. This is the very lawyer, whom Ben Jonson describes in the following lines:

"Gives forked counsel; takes provoking gold,
On either hand, and puts it up.
So wise, so grave, of so perplex'd a tongue,
And *loud* withal, that would not wag, nor scarce
Lie still without a *fee*."

14 Aug. 1769—"If to the elegance, novelty, and bitterness of this ingenious sarcasm, we add *the natural melody of the amiable Sir Fletcher Norton's pipe*, we shall not be surprised that Mr. Grenville was unable to make him any reply."

14 Dec. 1770—"The riot in the House of Lords has shocked the delicacy of Sir Fletcher Norton. Upon occasion of some clamour yesterday, he called to them, with all the softness of a bassoon, *Pray, gentlemen, be orderly; you are almost as bad as the other House.*"

Junius, from a cause with which we are unacquainted, must have had some personal dislike to the Speaker. An indifferent writer would not have treated him so disrespectfully, since there was no purpose to answer, nor any political measure that could possibly have derived advantage from it. As far as Lord George Sackville was concerned, we have evidence to prove, that he considered him totally unfit to fill that high station, and therefore opposed his election.

On the death of Sir John Cust, which took place soon after the opening of Parliament in 1770, Lord North proposed Sir Fletcher Norton to fill the vacant seat. Mr. Rigby seconded the motion. The name of this worthy knight did not coincide with Lord George's wishes. He therefore seconded *Lord John Cavendish* in his

proposal for the Right Hon. Thomas Townshend*. Sir Fletcher, being a staunch ministerial man, was of course duly elected. This circumstance may also account for the private letter of Junius to Mr. Woodfall, No. 10—"I shall be glad to see the paquet you speak of. It cannot come from the *Cavendishes*, though there be no end of the family. *They would not be so silly as to put their arms on the cover.*"

Jan. 22, 1770—Lord George Sackville Germain. "I beg leave to second the noble Lord's motion, Mr. Townshend, while the other gentleman [Sir F. N.] has been practising in the courts below, has been learning business of a superior kind; the business of the nation and this house. I will not say that persons in a certain walk of life, have notions of right or wrong superior to those of others, or that the mere sense of right and wrong of honour, is worn off by a constant and intended attention to the right and wrong of law: there have been men of honour, in the true sense of the word, in every situation; but it is no disgrace to any man not to know what he has had no opportunity to learn: If I were to choose, or to vote for the Speaker of the bench in another place, I do not know any one whom I should prefer to Sir

* Afterwards Lord Sydney—Lord George Sackville's most intimate friend.

Fletcher Norton : but placing a person in that chair, as Speaker of the House, is another object. It is with great pleasure that I hear justice done to the memory of the gentleman whose loss we are endeavouring to supply : and upon this occasion I may be permitted to observe, that he was not much acquainted with the practice of the courts ; as he was, notwithstanding, in every respect equal to his office, it may fairly be inferred, that much acquaintance with the practice of the courts below, is not a necessary qualification for it. Forms of practice are things very different from rules of right. It does not, therefore, seem to follow, that a gentleman whose opinion has precluded such in law and equity, is therefore qualified to regulate the proceedings of this house : a man may be well acquainted with the face of a country, and its divisions as laid down in a map, without knowing a step of the road to a single market town ; and he that has been used to travel the turnpike road, on journeys of business, may be less acquainted with the shorter cuts through parks, forests, and privileged places, than those whose situations and connections have admitted them to the chase, which is regulated by rules very different from paying toll at a turnpike, or paying bills at an inn. Upon the whole, I should think a minute acquaintance with the practice of courts of law,

rather a disqualification for the chair in this house.”

Not satisfied with this opposition to Sir Fletcher, he resumed the subject again in the year 1780, and finally succeeded in removing him. Notwithstanding which removal, Sir Fletcher continued an active member of the House.

The subject was ably brought forward by Lord George in describing to the House the qualifications needful for a Speaker :

“ To be capable of filling the chair with dignity, the person proposed must understand the constitution of the state, be well acquainted with the law of the land, and, above all, be perfectly master of the law of Parliament. He must have a zealous attachment to the rights and privileges of the Commons of England, and a sufficient degree of ability and integrity to support, maintain, and defend them ; he must be diligent without being precipitate, and firm and decisive without being arbitrary or rash ; and that which he considered as a Speaker’s most important duty, was his conducting himself with the strictest impartiality on every occasion. The office, he said, was a very laborious one, and required full health and vigour. The right honourable gentleman, who last filled the chair, when he was first elevated to that high situation, was in possession of every qua-

lification, both of body and mind, which the duties of the office called for : but the House had, unhappily for the right honourable gentleman, and unhappily for the public, been witness, in the course of the last session, that the right honourable gentleman's constitution was much impaired. He therefore flattered himself, that it would not be thought that he made an improper motion, when he proposed Charles Wolfran Cornwall *, Esq. to fill the Chair."—After considerable opposition—elected.

Article XX.—That Junius was necessarily a friend to his printer, Mr. Woodfall.

“As to the House of Commons there may be more danger. But even then, I am fully satisfied the ministry will exert themselves to quash such an enquiry, and *on the other side you will have friends.*”—No. 15, Private Letter.

The last letter Mr. Woodfall received from Junius was dated January 19, 1773 : concluding thus :—

“You have never flinched that I know of : and I shall always rejoice to hear of your prosperity. If you have any thing to communicate of moment to yourself, you may use the *last address* and give a hint.”

* Another of Lord George's intimate friends.

Mr. Woodfall's answer terminated their correspondence, and to all appearance any further connection between them: but the following year, Feb. 7, 1774, an opportunity offered to render Mr. Woodfall a service which was totally unlooked for. The recollection of the confidence which Junius had reposed in his printer, and which had been so honourably maintained, was a sufficient inducement for Lord George to befriend him on the present occasion. John Horne Tooke was subpoenaed before the House of Commons, for a libel on the Speaker, and Henry Sampson Woodfall, for printing it. Many able speeches were made for and against Mr. Tooke: Lord George, who recollected his old opponent, preserved an entire silence: but when Captain Phipps presented a petition from Henry Sampson Woodfall, owning the enormity of the offence, and throwing himself upon the clemency of the House, Lord George was the only man who spoke in favour of receiving it, "hoping the House would discharge the prisoner at the bar: *his* case, he said, was singularly hard; he was about to be severely punished for what his brother printers were daily guilty of, viz. printing the proceedings of the House: that the Speaker signed an order, which appeared at the bottom of every day's printed votes, that no man should print the proceedings of the House, without his ex-

press leave ; and yet they had been told, at their own bar by the petitioner, that he had been a printer for near twenty years, and never incurred the displeasure of the House before ; a tacit implication, that the House themselves were less rigid in supporting their own orders than their honour required. He therefore was for discharging this first offender, and letting their present lenity operate as a notice, that they were determined to punish with the utmost severity the next person who merited their resentment."

Colonel Onslow told the House, " he understood *an honourable member* had advised the printer not to appear, but as he did appear contrary to his advice, he should be for discharging him."—Mr. Woodfall discharged.

I previously observed, that Lord George was the only one who spoke in Mr. Woodfall's favour. I do not consider Colonel Onslow's remark amounts to that. It was evidently an insinuation against some one present. Junius in one of his private letters says, " I know Onslow perfectly, he is a false silly fellow."

Article XXI.—That Junius must have resided almost wholly in London, from his correspondence with Mr. Woodfall, to whom he gave notice when he occasionally went into the country. One

of his letters being dated Pall Mall, we may fairly presume his town house was in that street.

The letters commenced April 28, 1767, and concluded May 12, 1772.—One letter to Mr. Woodfall is of a later date, Jan. 19, 1773. This terminated the correspondence. By an examination of the dates during this period, we find that the writer could not have been absent for many weeks together, and previous to the short excursions he occasionally made, he informed Mr. Woodfall of his intention. A further proof of his being almost constantly in town, is the readiness with which he answered his Letters, for instance, in his correspondence with Mr. Wilkes.

On the 21st August, 1771, Junius wrote his first letter to Mr. Wilkes. On this letter is written in Mr. Wilkes's own hand, the following memorandum:—

Aug. 21, 1771—"Received on Wednesday noon by a chairman, who said he brought it from a gentleman whom he saw in Lancaster Court, in the Strand."—J. W.

On the 7th Sept. 1771, Junius wrote again.

On the 9th Sept. 1771, Mr. Wilkes obeyed the writer's instructions, by the following advertisement in "The Public Advertiser."

"Princes Court, Monday, Sept. 9.

"Mr. Wilkes had the honour of receiving from the same gentleman, two excellent letters

on important subjects, one dated August 21, the other September 7. He begs the favour of the author to prescribe the mode of Mr. Wilkes's communicating his answer."

The following morning Mr. Wilkes received an answer from Junius by the Penny-post, as follows:—

10 Sept. 1771—"You may intrust Woodfall with a letter for me. Leave the rest to his management.

"I expect that you will not enter into any explanations with him whatsoever."

During this period Lord George Sackville was constant in his attendance on Parliament, and to use his own words, "greatly interested himself in the honour of the nation." The house occupied by the late Mr. Angerstein, in Pall-Mall, was his lordship's town residence for many years.

Article XXII.—That from Junius's remembrance of the Walpolean battles, his seeing the Jesuitical books burnt in Paris, and his avowal of a long experience of the world, as well as from other circumstances mentioned in his correspondence with Mr. Wilkes, he could not be less than fifty years of age at the time of writing those letters.

In his dedication to the English nation, he expresses a hope, in animated language, that

“Civil liberty may *still* last the life of Junius.”

“*After long experience of the world*, I affirm before God, I never knew a rogue who was not unhappy.”—Private letter to Mr. Woodfall, No. 44.

“Many thanks for your obliging offer; *but alas! my age and figure* would do but little credit to my partner. I acknowledge the relation between Cato and Portia, but in truth I see no connexion between Junius and a minuet.”—Private letter to Mr. Wilkes, No. 77.

“*Long habit* has taught me to pass by all the declamation with which champions parade. I look upon it as no better than those flourishes of the back sword with which the great masters *of my time* in the amphitheatre entertained the spectators, merely to shew their dexterity, but which made no part of the real engagement.”—Miscellaneous Letter, 10 June 1769.

This paragraph not only proves Junius to have passed the meridian of life, but that he was a military character; the use of the broad sword being a branch of an officer's education.

23 April, 1768—“I remember *seeing* Bas-sambaum, Saurez, Molina, and a score of other Jesuitical books, burnt at Paris for their sound casuistry by the hands of the common hangman.”

This not only proves to us, that Junius had been in France, but that it must have been at a period between Queen Anne's war and the war in Germany. Sir N. Wraxall says, that Lord George, when *young*, accompanied his father Lionel, Duke of Dorset, to Paris, and in all probability it was at this period that he saw the conflagration of Jesuitical books.

10 June, 1769—"I remember the great Walpolean battles."

Junius refers to the year 1741, when Sir Robert Walpole was expelled the House of Commons. Lord George does not appear to have been a member at that time; he therefore says, "I am an *old reader* of political controversy."

Article XXIII.—That from the hints Junius gave to his printer, Mr. Woodfall, we may infer, arrangements had been made for his coming into office; which, though not accepted by him at the time, were sufficiently important to induce him to write no more.

"I doubt much whether I shall ever have the pleasure of knowing you; but if things take the turn I expect, you shall know *me by my works*."

—No. 17.

"Act honourably by me, and at a proper time *you shall know me*."—No. 41.

"My letter of Monday will, I hope, convince

the author, that I am neither a partisan of Mr. Wilkes, nor yet bought off by the ministry. *It is true I have refused offers* which a more prudent, or a more interested man would have accepted. Whether it be simplicity or virtue in me I can only affirm that *I am in earnest.*—Miscellaneous Letter, 12 April, 1769.

There was at one time a proposition for Lord George to be under secretary of state, but he declined it from his unwillingness to unite with those men who had treated him so unhand-
somely.

“I have seen the signals thrown out for your old friend and correspondent. Be assured that I have had good reasons for not complying with them. *In the present state of things*, if I were to write again, I must be as silly as any of the horned cattle, that run mad through the city, or as any of *your* wise aldermen.”—Private Letter to Mr. Woodfall, No. 63. Jan. 19, 1773.

A new ministry was formed in 1775, when Lord George Germain became secretary of state for the American colonies, an office previously held by the Earl of Hillsborough; by this arrangement, Junius's prediction in his letter to the Earl of Hillsborough, 20th September, 1768, became fully verified.

The anticipation of such an event would na-

turally account for the extreme caution of Junius, and for the fear he always entertained of being discovered.

Article XXIV.—Finally—That so powerful an attack on the *private characters* of persons of such high rank, being inconsistent with the pen of political writers in general, who condemn measures, and not character, we may reasonably conclude that they proceeded from the pen of one who had received a severe wound from some of those individuals who formed part of the existing administration.

This article, as far as regards the personal motive of Junius, is already answered in the former part of the work. It now remains to notice his general censure of ministers in a *political* point of view, wherein I shall prove that the same strong and powerful language employed by Junius, is strictly in unison with Lord George Sackville's speeches in the House of Commons at that period,—a few instances will suffice.

Junius says—6th Oct. 1768—“It is impossible for an honest man to behold the circumstances, to which a weak distracted administration has reduced us, without feeling one pang at least for the approaching ruin of Great Britain.”

“I am not surprised that the generality of men

should endeavour to shut their eyes to this melancholy prospect. Yet I am filled with indignation, when I behold a wise and gallant people lost in a stupidity which does not feel, because it does not look forward. The voice of one man will hardly be heard when the voice of truth and reason is neglected; but as far as mine extends, *the authors of our ruin* shall be marked out to the public. I will not tamely submit to be sacrificed, nor shall this country perish without warning.”—Letter XLVIII., 19 Oct. 1768.

14th November, 1768—“In this and my former letters I have presented to you, with plainness and sincerity, the melancholy condition to which we are reduced. The characters of a weak and worthless ministry would hardly deserve the attention of history, but that they are fatally united, and must be recorded with the misfortunes of the country. If there be yet a spark of virtue left among us, this great nation shall not be sacrificed to the fluctuating interests or wayward passions of a minister, nor even to the caprices of a monarch. If there be no virtue left, it is no matter who are ministers, nor how soon they accomplish our destruction.”

24th Dec. 1770—“Give me leave, Mr. Woodfall, to ask you a serious question. How long do you think it possible for this management to last? I will answer you with precision. It will

last, until there is a general insurrection of the English nation.”

At the opening of the session of parliament, early in January, 1770, we find Lord George Sackville in the House, foremost in the ranks, cavilling about the minister's answer to the King's speech.

He desired the proposed address might be read, and when the words “to offer to his Majesty our most dutiful thanks, for the favourable opinion he is pleased to entertain of our conduct” were pronounced, he rose, and in a most eloquent speech, addressed himself to the Speaker, as follows :

“ Sir, the honourable and learned gentleman [Attorney General de Grey*] who spoke last, has left us to guess at his real sentiments relative to the people's petition. He has not yet rightly formed his opinion ; he has not yet received full instructions. When his brief is enlarged, he will know what to plead. But this is not a time for delay ; the season is critical. *The minds of the people are alarmed, and they have high expectations from the deliberations of this House.* They are alarmed, lest the influence of ministers should have so far operated

* Afterwards Lord Walsingham. Under Secretary of State in Lord George's office during the American War.

as to surprise their representatives into a vote dangerous to their liberties. And it behoves us to be extremely careful in our addresses to the throne, lest we should rather confirm than remove those suspicions. If these have their foundation in truth, and more has been done than can be justified, it certainly behoves us rather to redress, than persist in the wrong. And notwithstanding what the honourable and learned gentleman has said against rescinding, it is no dishonour to this House to retract a hasty vote, nor is it without precedent. Acts of the whole legislature are frequently repealed, when they are found injurious or even disagreeable to the people; and it cannot surely be contended, that a vote of one branch of the legislature is more sacred than a solemn act of the whole. The practice of the inferior courts, which the honourable and learned gentleman seems better acquainted with than the proceedings of parliament, is no rule for this House. The decisions of this House are cognizable nowhere but in this House, and never to acknowledge itself to be in the wrong, would be to arrogate infallibility, which only one earthly power hath thought fit yet to claim. If the people's suspicions are without cause, they are general and strong; let us not therefore cherish ill-humour, but as we are the representatives of

the people, let us endeavour by every lenient method, to give the people satisfaction.

“The words that have now been read, do not seem to be calculated for that purpose, but rather to increase the popular jealousy and discontent. The minister by *artfully* introducing into the speech, his Majesty’s sense of the conduct to which the words refer, had no doubt a *design* to impose upon the nation, an opinion that the proceedings of the House upon a late occasion, were perfectly agreeable to his Majesty; an opinion than which nothing can be more injurious to his Majesty, nothing more offensive to the people. *The unprecedented decision of the majority of this House, with regard to the Middlesex election, has spread a gloom throughout the whole kingdom; every brow is clouded, and every heart is heavy**. The freedom of election is the sacred palladium of English liberty †; and when that is violated, it

* See Junius Letter xvi, 19th July, 1769, also Letter xxxix, 28th May, 1770.

† This speech was made long before Junius’s dedication of his letters to the English nation, wherein he says, “Let it be impressed upon your minds, let it be instilled into your children, that the liberty of the press is the *palladium* of all the civil, political, and religious rights of an Englishman.” In this instance, palladium is applied to the press, in Lord George’s speech, to elections.

cannot be long before our constitution is in ruins. It is not enough that the majority who decided the question, are satisfied with the recititude of their intentions; or that they did not mean to break in upon that freedom; the people must be satisfied. Their all is at stake; they apprehend that is in danger, and therefore they have a right to demand security. The powerful influence that operates in this House is too visible. The people see it and dread it. But a snare is now laid to involve our Sovereign in *the gulph of his corrupt administration*; to draw him in as a party, and to countenance *the desperate measures of his ministers*; a snare which it is to be hoped this House will break. Whoever can concur in offering such indignity to his Sovereign, is neither a good senator nor a good subject. He can have no worthy conception of the exalted character of a great prince, nor of the inestimable value of the liberty of a free people. Even if the words, excepted against, are suffered to pass, then it will be understood, that his Majesty approves the violation of which the people complain. And though his Majesty, *in the generous unsuspecting frankness of his nature*, may not perceive to what an unhappy catastrophe the perfidy of his ministers may lead, yet surely it is the duty of his parliament to guard him against the insidious artifices of

those, *who having rendered themselves odious by their conduct, have nothing more to do, but to render themselves secure by their cunning.* Does not every one perceive, that if this House is led to address his Majesty for his approbation of the proceedings of this House, or in other words, for the favourable opinion he entertains of its conduct, the people will immediately conclude, that he approves of the election of a representative*, whom the majority of the electors do not approve, and against whom the petitions of the people have been chiefly directed; that, as their petitions remain yet unanswered, this is intended as one general answer; and that the grievances of which they complain, will find no redress; that *their beneficent father* to whom their humble petitions were addressed, has, by *evil counsellors*, been determined against them; and that now, every dawn of hope, every glimmering of comfort, is quenched for ever, exempt from free remonstrances, or the last appeal. Was the cause of complaint of less importance, the clamours of the people would be less general. *But the people are in agitation throughout the whole British Empire.* They wait with loyal hearts, in expectation that their representatives will interest themselves in their behalf; if they are disappointed, that disap-

* Colonel Luttrell

pointment *may lead to despair, and the event may be dreadful.* Perhaps it is no uncharitable supposition that the *wary abettors* of these alarming measures, may hope by these repeated outrages to provoke the spirit of the people to the last extremity, with a view to wreak their vengeance upon such as are brave enough to *risk their lives in the support of the Constitution.* They may wish for a repetition of the bloody massacre in St. George's Fields*, or for a more bloody warfare among the petitioners. In that general confusion they may hope to escape, or perish in the tumult with honest men. If this be their hope, appearances are strong in their favour. The people are already sensible of *the malignity of their hearts*, and are ripe for doing themselves justice, if justice is denied them in the ordinary course. Nor are the perpetrators of these wrongs insensible of the people's inclinations, or remiss in preparation to give them a hostile reception; why else are troops marching at this peaceable juncture, from all quarters of the capital? why else an order for the augmentation of troops in a sister island? why a reinforcement of our army at home with three regiments of *neighbouring mercenaries*? Is it possible that an English House of Commons can see

* See Miscellaneous Letters of Junius, 19th May, 1768, 30th August, 1768, also Letters 27th February, 1772, and 10th March, 1772.

all this with indifference? Can, with eyes open to the dangers that threaten the noblest constitution which the world ever beheld, sit still and approve the measures by which its ruin is to be accomplished? What will the people say of such a house? What will posterity say? Some future historian, lamenting the shattered remains of ruined liberty, may possibly conclude, ‘*Vendidit hic patriam auro!*’ Let not this opprobrium degrade the dignity of this house, lest the people, despairing of relief from a corrupted parliament, begin to deride its authority, *and resolve to be governed without one.* What has happened in other free states, is not impossible to happen in this. The subjects of Denmark once boasted of the protection of parliament. The parliament betrayed their liberties, and they, in return, abolished the parliament. While the parliament continues independent, the people remain in security, but if once the representatives of the people are suspected of corruption, if once they are capable of entering into league against the people, all confidence will be at an end; the authority of the House will gradually decline, and at length the people, growing indifferent, will patiently acquiesce in the arbitrary decrees of *one tyrant*, rather than submit to pay the hire of corruption *for three or four hundred.*”

Can any one read this speech, without being forcibly reminded of the strong, energetic, powerful language of Junius? Many of the sentences are almost verbatim. The same violent attack on the ministers, the same voice in reference to the king, the same allusion to the freedom of election, the massacre in St. George's Fields, the expulsion of Mr. Wilkes, and finally, a fear lest the shattered remains of the Constitution should fall a prey to the violence of the people, and they in the end resolve to be governed without a Parliament. The reader has already been referred to several paragraphs in Junius's Letters; it remains to adduce another instance in allusion to the latter part of the speech which is nearly sufficient to identify the writer, without the mass of evidence already brought forward.—Lord George could not have borrowed his ideas from Junius, provided he were not the author, as the speech was delivered in 1770, and the following quotations written in 1771.

9 April, 1771—"This violent state of things cannot long continue. Either the laws and Constitution must be preserved by a dreadful appeal to the sword; or *the people will grow weary of their condition, and surrender every thing into the King's hands, rather than submit to be*

trampled upon any longer by five hundred of their equals."

In his dedication, Junius says—"But I am persuaded you will not leave it to the choice of seven hundred persons, notoriously corrupted by the crown, whether seven millions of their equals shall be freemen or slaves. The certainty of forfeiting their own rights, when they sacrifice those of the nation, is no check to a brutal degenerate mind. Without insisting upon the extravagant concession made to Harry the Eighth, *there are instances in the history of other countries, of a formal, deliberate, surrender of the public liberty into the hands of the Sovereign.* If England does not share the same fate, it is because we have better resources than in the virtue of either house of Parliament."—In his speech, Lord George quotes Denmark as an example.

It has been matter of enquiry with many who have investigated the Letters of Junius, why that writer should have interested himself with city politics, moving, as he did, in a sphere so remote from that quarter.

In his controversy with Mr. Horne, he takes an opportunity of expressing his opinion of a few of the leading city characters, as well as in Letter LVIII., 30 Sept. 1771, addressed to the Livery of London.

The cause of this deviation from his general plan, appears to have been his regard for Alderman Sawbridge, a public spirited man, of a good family resident at Olintigh, in the parish of Wye, in Kent.

He was Major in the East Kent Militia, and afterwards Colonel of the East Battalion—on intimate terms with Sir Jeffery Amherst and Lord George Sackville.

These three families, whose estates were situated in Kent, possessed considerable influence in the county, particularly that of Lord George Sackville, he being descended from a much more ancient and powerful house. He represented Hythe in two successive parliaments in conjunction with William Glanville, Esq. On the decease of that gentleman, which took place in 1765, the vacancy was filled up by William Amherst, Esq., brother to Sir Jeffery. In the new parliament of 1768 Lord George resigned in favour of Alderman Sawbridge. The election was however strongly contested by the ministerial party, but Lord George's interest was so great, that Alderman Sawbridge was returned by a considerable majority.

The borough of East Grinstead having been purchased by Lord George, he took his seat in parliament accordingly, and continued to represent it until he was called to the Upper-House.

The line of politics pursued by Alderman Sawbridge was strictly in unison with Lord George's principles at this eventful period. Both were strenuous in their efforts to shorten the duration of parliaments. This is a characteristic trait in Junius, and it is evident from the interest uniformly manifested by that writer towards Alderman Sawbridge, that he was not only personally acquainted with him, and respected his private character, but was a sincere admirer of his principles as a politician.

The first letter that Wilkes received from Junius is *wholly on the subject of appointing Mr. Sawbridge Lord Mayor*. Had Junius been a disinterested writer, or had he been sufficiently acquainted with the regulations of the Mayoralty, he would not have attempted to alter the regular succession, as there appears to have been nothing in the private character of Mr. Nash to pass his name over.

Mr. Wilkes, in reply, explains his reasons for not acceding to Junius's wishes, and candidly informs him, that he thinks Junius possesses too favourable an opinion of Alderman Sawbridge.

Sawbridge was a military man, far more fitted for the field than the civic chair. Why Junius should make a confidant of Wilkes to endeavour to place his friend in that elevated station must now be matter of conjecture; certain it is,

he wished Wilkes to befriend him. On the receipt of Mr. Wilkes's answer, Junius was angry with him for non-compliance with his request; he was also mortified in the extreme, when he heard Mr. Nash had triumphed.—“What an abandoned prostituted idiot,” he observes to Mr. Woodfall, “is *your* Lord Mayor. The shameful mismanagement which brought him into office, gave me the first, and an unconquerable disgust.”

Junius must have had some private motive for taking such an extraordinary interest in the success of Alderman Sawbridge. His friendship for that gentleman is apparent in many other instances.

Letter LIX. 5 October, 1771—he says—

“In these circumstances it were much to be desired, *that we had many such men as Mr. Sawbridge to represent us in parliament.* I speak from common report and opinion only, when I impute to him a speculative predilection in favour of a republic.—*In the personal conduct and manners of the man, I cannot be mistaken.* He has shewn himself possessed of that republican firmness, which the times require, and by which an English gentleman may be as usefully and as honourably distinguished, as any citizen of ancient Rome, of Athens, or Lacedæmon.”

In the conclusion of Letter LII. 24 July, 1771—

“ As for Mr. Sawbridge, *whose character I really respect*, I am astonished he does not see through your duplicity.”

I have now gone through the several articles specified in the Preface, as essential to the character of Junius, and, I believe, every candid reader must acknowledge that the evidence adduced is clear, sound, and indisputable. Other circumstances of a political nature, such as questions relative to the Falkland Islands, Convention with Spain, &c., will be noticed in the parliamentary summary of his Lordship's life. Previous to entering upon this interesting and important termination of our Enquiry, I shall touch upon the secrecy preserved by the author, which will draw our attention to one very important fact hitherto unexplained.

From a combination of circumstances, I am strongly prejudiced with the opinion, that Junius was the sole depository of his own secret ; that it was of too great importance to entrust to the confidence of a second person, although there are one or two expressions in his correspondence with Mr. Woodfall that would argue to the contrary. These, however, are much more easily accounted for, than the numerous reasons he assigned why concealment was necessary. If other persons had been in the confidence

of Junius, in all probability some unguarded expression or inadvertency, would either have revealed the author to the world, or would have given some clue, which, ere this, might have led to a discovery.

In Private Letter, No. 8, Junius says—

“ The last letter you printed was idle and improper, and, I assure you, printed against my own opinion. The truth is, there are people about me, whom I would wish not to contradict, and who had rather see Junius in the papers, ever so improperly, than not at all. I wish it could be recalled.”

The fact is, he considered the Letter in question beneath his dignity, as a writer in the high station of Junius; and therefore endeavoured to persuade Mr. Woodfall that he had yielded to the opinion of others: with regard to the remaining clause, we may either take it as it literally stands, or, that those about him, knowing he was hostile to the Government, would like to read any thing in the papers censuring the conduct of those men who had been privy to his disgrace at court, without having the slightest knowledge that he himself was the real author.

With respect to the gentleman who conducted the conveyancing department, it is evident that this was a mere deception, should any one occasionally get a glimpse of him. Had he

employed such a gentleman, the waiters at the coffee-houses must have *known him*, by his so frequently going backwards and forwards, and therefore would not have refused delivering up the letters.

In No. 51. he says, "The gentleman who transacts the *conveyancing part* of our correspondence, tells me there was much difficulty last night. For this reason, and because it could be no way material for me to see a paper on Saturday which is to appear on Monday, I resolved not to send for it."

He could not have explained the reason to Mr. Woodfall in any other way.

In No. 58 he says, "Your letter was twice refused last night, and the waiter as often attempted to *see the person* who sent for it."

This evidently implies that he was in waiting near the spot, till the chairman returned. As a further confirmation of the opinion that this gentleman, was himself, we need only refer to Mr. Jackson's testimony, who stated, "that he *once* saw a tall gentleman, dressed in a light coat, with bag and sword, *throw* into the office door, opening in Ivy-lane, a letter of Junius's, which he picked up, and immediately followed the bearer of it into St. Paul's Church-yard, where he got into a hackney coach and drove off."

Now this tall gentleman wore a bag and sword. Lord George always wore a bag, and although

at that time he was not in the army, yet he invariably wore a sword; of this we have undeniable proof by the fine portrait of him published by Alderman Boydell in 1775. Lord George was also very tall, being full six feet in stature; and with respect to the light coat, it was evidently a disguise. Had it not been Junius himself, he would not have taken such precaution to avoid notice, as was the case when the waiter twice went out to gain a sight of him. We may therefore conclude, that on that evening, finding no chairman on the stand, and being anxious for the delivery of the letter which it was of consequence should appear the following day, he delivered it himself. This is the only instance of Mr. Jackson's observation.

I am inclined to think, that he was constantly in the habit of going out with the letters himself, and on meeting with a chairman, fee'd him to deliver them; as was the case with the one to Mr. Wilkes, who questioned the man, from whom he brought it. To which he replied—"From a gentleman whom he saw in Lancaster Court, in the Strand."—Had Junius regularly employed a gentleman on such occasions, he would have sent him that evening to Mr. Wilkes, the letter being of very great importance.—It appears to me that he invariably took his station in disguise in a similar manner, when he had occasion to obtain Mr. Woodfall's an-

swers. This was attended with considerable trouble, and, however improbable such a circumstance may appear, it certainly was not impossible; in fact, it is strictly in unison with the character of Junius, who considered nothing too arduous to accomplish his end. It would even be a relaxation from his labours, and the amusing change, a relief to his mind, which at times, by his own confession, wanted recreation. Who else, I ask, would have spent nearly five years of his life in constant writing, for no emolument whatsoever? so that I conceive both circumstances are united in the same unprecedented cause. Having shewn, that, however improbable such a circumstance might be, it was, nevertheless, not impossible; let us examine further instances, in support of such an opinion. Can any assertion be stronger than the following, to Mr. Wilkes?

“I willingly accept of as much of your friendship as you can impart to a man whom *you will assuredly never know*. Besides every personal consideration, if I were known, I could no longer be an useful servant to the public. At present there is something oracular in the delivery of my opinions. *I speak from a recess which no human curiosity can penetrate*, and darkness, we are told, is one source of the sublime.”—Again:

“I have faithfully served the public, without

the possibility of a personal advantage. As Junius, I can never expect to be rewarded. The secret is too important to be committed to any great man's discretion. If views of interest or ambition could tempt me to betray *my own secret*, how could I flatter myself that the man I trusted would not act upon the same principles, and sacrifice me at once to the King's curiosity and resentment?"

18 Sept. 1771—"I wish you to point out to me where you think the force of the *formal legal* lies. In pursuing such enquiries I lie under a singular disadvantage. *Not venturing to consult those who are qualified to inform me*, I am forced to collect every thing from books, or common conversation. The pains I took with that paper upon privilege, were greater than I can express to you. Yet, after I had blinded myself with poring over Journals, Debates, and Parliamentary History, I was at last obliged to hazard a bold assertion, which I am now convinced is true."

6 Nov. 1771—"Besides the fallibility natural to us all, no man writes under so many disadvantages as I do. *I cannot consult the learned, I cannot directly ask the opinion of my acquaintance*, and in the newspapers I never am assisted. Those who are conversant with books, well know how often they mislead us, *when we have not a living*

monitor at hand, to assist us in comparing practice with theory.”

“Tell me candidly whether you know or suspect who I am.”—Private Letter to Mr. Woodfall, No. 3.

“I shall be glad to see the packet you speak of. It cannot come from the Cavendishes, though there be no end of the family. They would not be so silly as to put their arms on the cover. *As to me*, be assured that it is not in the nature of things, *that they, or you, or any body else, should ever know me, unless I make myself known*. All arts, or enquiries, or rewards, would be equally ineffectual.”—No. 10.

This implies an acquaintance with the Cavendishes, though not of sufficient intimacy as to entrust them with the secret.

“When you consider to what excessive enmities I may be exposed, you will not wonder at my caution.”—No. 19.

“I would send the above to Garrick directly, but that I would avoid having the hand too commonly seen. Oblige me, then, so much as to have it copied, in any hand, and sent by the penny-post, that is, if you dislike sending it in your own writing. I must be more cautious than ever. I am sure I should not survive a discovery three days; or, if I did, *they would attain me by bill*. Change to the Somerset

Coffee-house, and let no mortal know the alteration.”—No. 41.

On the 8th Nov. 1771—Junius in a note to Mr. Woodfall says, “Beware of David Garrick, he was sent to pump you, and went directly to *Richmond* to tell the King I should write no more.”

This is the first time Garrick’s name is mentioned. It must have been matter of enquiry with every reader, how Junius should know that Garrick was employed to find him out?

How Junius should know that Garrick had been to Richmond after Mr. Woodfall’s communication with him?

How Junius should know what passed between Garrick and the King, on the subject of his writing no more?

Junius not only knew every circumstance above mentioned, but was apprised of the whole transaction *on the ensuing morning*, as appears from the following note to Garrick; which he requested Mr. Woodfall to forward.

“ TO MR. DAVID GARRICK.

“ November 10th, 1771.

“ I AM very exactly informed of your impertinent inquiries, and of the information you so busily sent to Richmond, and with what triumph and exultation it was received. *I knew every*

particular of it the next day. Now mark me, vagabond—keep to your pantomimes, or be assured you shall hear of it. Meddle no more, thou busy informer! It is in *my* power to make you curse the hour in which you dared to interfere with—JUNIUS.”—No. 41.

We have no other means of accounting for the quickness of the communication, but by supposing Junius was at Richmond on that day.

The palace which the King occupied at that time was situate near Richmond Green. The entrance to the grounds was exactly opposite to a house formerly the residence of Thompson the poet.

At the era in question, *this house was rented by Lord George Sackville*, who, during this eventful period of his life, spent part of his time here, which not only offered him an occasional retirement, but facilitated his means of information on what was passing in the King's household.

The front of the house so completely overlooked the palace, that, without exciting suspicion, he could notice the daily arrivals with the utmost facility.

His friend Colonel Amherst, also, who was one of the King's aid-de-camps, would naturally be of service to him with regard to any particular intelligence.

The King's palace has been pulled down several years, and the grounds now form part of the Richmond Gardens. Lady Shaftesbury at present resides in the house formerly rented by Lord George Sackville.

The circumstance that Lord George *did* occupy this house at the time of Garrick's visit, was communicated to me by W. Little, Esq. of Richmond, which has also been *fully confirmed* by a most respectable old gentleman, a long inhabitant of the place, who knew Lord George personally, at the time of his residence there.

In his dedication Junius says, "I am the *sole* depository of my own secret, and it shall perish with me."

3d March, 1769—To Sir William Draper—he says "And now, Sir William, I shall take my leave of you for ever. Motives very different from any apprehension of *your resentment*, make it impossible you should ever know me."

25th Sept. 1769—"As to me, it is by no means necessary that I should be exposed to *the resentment* of the worst and the most powerful men in the country, though I may be indifferent about yours. Though *you* would fight, *others* would assassinate."

A few days after Junius's violent letter to the Duke of Grafton, Mr. Woodfall received a most extraordinary letter from his correspond-

ent, wherein he says “*I really doubt whether I shall write any more under this signature.* I am weary of attacking a set of brutes whose writings are too dull to furnish me even with the materials of contention, and whose measures are too gross and direct to be the subject of argument, or to require illustration.”

“That Swinney is a wretched, but a dangerous fool. He had the impudence to go to Lord George Sackville, whom he had never spoken to, and to ask him whether or no he was the author of Junius—take care of him.”

“Whenever you have any thing to communicate to me, let the hint be thus, C at the usual place, and so direct to Mr. John Fretley, where it is absolutely impossible I should be known.”

From a perusal of this letter, eight distinct questions arise :

I. Why should Junius think of altering his signature ?

II. How could Junius know that Swinney had called upon Lord George Sackville ?

III. How could Junius know that Swinney had never spoken to Lord George before ?

IV. Why should Junius alter the direction of Mr. John Middleton to Mr. John Fretley, in consequence of Swinney's call ?

V. How could this alteration operate, so that he could not possibly be known ?

VI. What difference could it make to Junius, Swinney having called upon a wrong person?

VII. Would not Junius, who was so anxious to preserve strict secrecy, have rejoiced at Swinney's mistake, instead of being angry with him?

VIII. Is not the language used by Junius in speaking of Swinney, directly in unison with Lord George Sackville's language to Mr. Luttrell in the House of Commons, where the word "wretched" occurs in both instances?

The internal evidence of the communication to Mr. Woodfall which gives rise to the above queries, in my opinion cannot be satisfactorily explained in any other way than that Junius and Lord George Sackville were one and the same person.

Chance, I am aware, in some common occurrences might operate so as to reverse this judgment; but I cannot see it possible how an utter stranger should call upon Lord George Sackville at his residence in Pall-Mall, and that it should *so happen* that Lord George should be acquainted with Junius, whom no other individual could possibly trace then, and has never been able to trace down to the present hour.

Let those who have never examined the subject before, weigh this concluding testimony; they cannot but be struck with the coincidence.

Having shewn, that the enemies of Junius

were the enemies of Lord Viscount Sackville ; that the friends of Junius were the friends of Lord Viscount Sackville ; and that the line of politics laid down by the former, was strictly pursued by the latter, it now only remains to affix further testimonials of his Lordship's abilities, which have occasionally been called in question, as inadequate to the performance of the Letters. The able speeches which have been brought forward, as evidence of his Lordship's opinions, clearly prove that he was competent to speak or write on any subject. There were very few topics that came before the House, on which his Lordship did not enlarge. These speeches have, undoubtedly, been read with interest by all Statesmen and Members of Parliament. For the satisfaction of other readers, I shall lay before them a few testimonials of eminent men who were well acquainted with him, and who were competent judges to discriminate between natural and acquired talent :—

“ There was no trash in his mind.”—William Gerard Hamilton.

“ Lord Sackville never suffered the clearness of his conceptions to be clouded by any obscurity of expressions.”—Richard Cumberland.

“ Lord Sackville's countenance indicated intellect, particularly his eye, the motions of which were quick and piercing.”—Sir N. Wraxall.

“I thank the Noble Lord for every proposition he has held out: they are worthy of a great mind, and such as ought to be adopted.”—Lord North.

“Lord George Sackville was a man of very sound parts, of distinguished bravery, and of as honourable eloquence.”—Lord Orford, Vol. i. p. 244.

“The late Lord Sackville, who was a man of extraordinary talent, wrote a beautiful eulogy on the Princess of Orange, but which never graced the press.

“The genius, learning, and exalted virtues of the Princess, were the theme of his Lordship’s all-powerfull pen.

“He had the art of painting in words, to a very eminent degree, and which afforded the finest ornaments in either poetry, history, or elocution.”—Gentleman’s Magazine, Sept. 1785.

“During the seven years that his Lordship was Secretary for the Colonies, he had, principally, Charles James Fox to contend with. Throughout this long and arduous period, he displayed signal ability in his replies.”—Parliamentary Debates.

“In business, Lord George Germain was rapid, yet clear and accurate; rather negligent in his style, which was that of a gentleman and a man of the world, unstudied, and frequently

careless, even in his official dispatches. But there was no obscurity or ambiguity in his compositions."—Sir N. Wraxall.

"Mr. Pitt styled Lord George Germain the Agamemnon of the day."—Sir N. Wraxall.

"In the debate on the Mutiny Bill, Lord Orford says that Lord George Sackville displayed more ability than Mr. Pitt" [afterwards Earl of Chatham].—Memoirs—Nov. 1754.

"Among the persons of eminence to whom Mr. Pitt had recourse for support, at this delicate crisis of his ministerial life [1783], when every parliamentary aid which could sustain him against the coalition, was anxiously sought after, the late Lord Sackville attracted his attention. That nobleman had, hitherto, taken no decided part in the debates during the progress of the East India Bill, though he voted against it personally," &c.—Sir N. Wraxall.

On the Marquis of Carmarthen's motion, in 1782, after Lord George Germain had been created a viscount by the King, Sir N. Wraxall observes:—

"His enemies confessed, that never was a more able, dignified, or manly appeal made within the walls of the House of Peers, than Lord Sackville pronounced on that occasion."

Debates on the Treaties in the Committee, 1755 :

“ Lord George Sackville, with as much spirit, and with sense as compact as the other’s [Mr. Beckford] was incoherent, replied, that if the question was agitating whether we should desert the war in America, and stick to the Continent, nobody would dare to support such an argument.”—Lord Orford.

Among the parliamentary orators of 1755, Lord George Sackville stands pre-eminent.

“ Lord George informed and convinced ; with a frankness in his speech, there was a mystery in his conduct, which was far from inviting.”—Lord Orford.

In 1756—“ Lord George Sackville spoke very sensibly on the situation of affairs, with some reproof on ministers.”—Lord Orford.

In 1756—On the question of employing the Hessian and Hanoverian Soldiers—

“ Lord George Sackville replied with great spirit and sense : and the motion was agreed to.”—Lord Orford.

In 1757—A Commission of Enquiry was directed concerning the Miscarriages at Rochfort, composed of the Duke of Marlborough, Lord George Sackville, and General Waldegrave. Upon this occasion, Lord Orford observes that “ Lord George Sackville was *more* than a balance to the other two in abilities.”

At the conclusion of Lord George Sackville’s

trial in 1760, Lord Orford pourtrays a certain character so applicable to Junius, that I cannot withhold inserting it here :—

“ Lord George’s own behaviour was most extraordinary. He had undoubtedly trusted to the superiority of his parts for extricating him. Most men in his situation would have adapted such parts to the conciliating the favour of his judges, to drawing the witnesses into contradictions, to misleading and bewildering the court, and to throwing the most specious colours on his own conduct, without offending the parties declared against him. Very different was the conduct of Lord George. From the outset, and during the whole process, he assumed a dictatorial style to the court, and treated the inferiority of their capacities as he would have done had he been sitting amongst them. He brow-beat the witnesses, gave the lie to Sloper, and used the judge-advocate, though a very clever man, with contempt. Nothing was timid, nothing humble in his behaviour. His replies were quick and spirited. He prescribed to the court, and they acquiesced. An instant of such resolution at Minden had established his character for ever.”

This intrepid and daring spirit was peculiar to Lord George through life ; it fully accords with the description given in a letter to a cer-

tain nobleman on the intricate question before us, wherein the writer says—

“Whenever Junius appears in a probable character, he is great and generous, above every idea of deriving a mercenary emolument from his writings, impatient and indignant at opposition, and fiery and implacable in his resentments. I have long felt assured this is no common man; and when you desire me to search for Junius amidst the discontented of his day, I look instinctively to the discontented of the noblest rank.

“Think of a genius not born in every country, or every time; a man gifted by nature with a penetrating and aquiline eye, with a judgment prepared with the most extensive erudition, with an Herculean robustness of mind, and nerves not to be broken by labour; a man who could spend twenty years in one pursuit.—Such a man was Junius.

“I cannot seek him among discontented politicians, for he was apparently bound to no set of men; and though he thought with Mr. Grenville, he is less distinguished by any political attachments or sympathies, *than by his abomination of one particular administration*; on the score of politics *alone* he has hitherto eluded our curiosity. As an injured person, to whom should we particularly direct our attention?”

A list of the different changes of administration from the Accession of George the Third to the commencement of Lord North's ministry, is inserted to shew, that Lord George Sackville was admitted into the Rockingham administration in 1765, as Vice-Treasurer of Ireland.

Lord Chatham's ministry commenced in 1766. In the new arrangement, the name of Lord George Sackville was not included. A few months after this event, Junius commenced his *Miscellaneous Letters, with a powerful attack on the Earl of Chatham*. It is proper to observe, that it was during that nobleman's ministry in 1760, that Lord George was disgraced at Court.

Lord George had fondly hoped, when he was recalled to a share in the government in 1765, that his disgrace was buried in oblivion: but this second instance of removal would naturally recall past events, and sour him against the Earl of Chatham and other members of the new administration who had objected to his taking a share in the government on the ground of the result of the Court-Martial. Lord Shelburne, for one, publicly stated in the House of Lords, that he had expressed as much on the occasion, for which reason assigned, he had received various indignities from Lord George. From this avowal of Lord Shelburne, we may conclude, that the Earl of Chatham, the Duke

of Grafton, and others who formed the new ministry, united in the same opinion, as we find, that every member of the new administration mentioned by Junius, came under that writer's censure, with the exception of Thomas Townshend, afterwards Lord Sydney. Mr. Cumberland says, that Lord Sydney was one of Lord Sackville's most intimate friends, and corresponded with him to his dying hour.

The summary of his Lordship's strangely diversified life, to which the reader's attention is now directed, will be read with increased interest, connected as it is, with the foregoing Enquiry.

A LIST OF THE GENERAL CHANGES OF THE MINISTRY,

FROM

THE ACCESSION OF GEORGE III. TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF LORD NORTH'S MINISTRY, IN THE YEAR 1770,

INCLUDING THOSE SUBORDINATE MEMBERS OF WHOM FREQUENT MENTION IS MADE IN THE LETTERS OF JUNIUS.

(FROM VARIOUS AUTHENTIC DOCUMENTS.)

<i>Duke of Newcastle and Mr. Pitt's 2d Ministry.</i> <i>(As they stood at the Accession of George III.)</i>	<i>Lord North's Ministry.</i> <i>January, 1770.</i>	<i>Lord North's Ministry.</i> <i>December, 1767.</i>	<i>Lord Chatham's Ministry.</i> <i>August, 1766.</i>	<i>Lord Rockingham's Ministry.</i> <i>July, 1765.</i>	<i>Duke of Bedford's, Mr. George Grenville's Ministry.</i> <i>April, 1763.</i>	<i>Lord Bute's Ministry.</i> <i>May, 1762.</i>	<i>Lord North's Ministry.</i> <i>June 1761.</i>	<i>Lord North's Ministry.</i> <i>January, 1770.</i>
Chancellor	Lord Bathurst	Lord Camden	Lord Camden	Lord Northampton	Lord Northampton	Lord Northampton	Lord Northampton	Lord Bathurst
President	Lord Gower	Lord Gower	Lord Northampton	Lord Northampton	Lord Northampton	Lord Northampton	Lord Northampton	Lord Gower
Privy Seal	Duke of Grafton	{ Ld. Chatham till Oct. 1768 } Lord Hertford	Lord Chatham	Duke of Newcastle	Duke of Newcastle	Duke of Newcastle	Duke of Newcastle	Duke of Grafton
Chamberlain	Lord Bristol	Lord Hertford	Lord Hertford	Duke of Portland	Duke of Portland	Duke of Portland	Duke of Portland	Lord Bristol
Steward	Lord Talbot	Lord Talbot	Lord Talbot	Lord Huntingdon	Lord Huntingdon	Lord Huntingdon	Lord Huntingdon	Lord Talbot
of the Horse	Duke of Ancaster	Duke of Ancaster	Duke of Ancaster	Duke of Rutland	Duke of Rutland	Duke of Rutland	Duke of Rutland	Duke of Ancaster
of the Treasury	Lord North	Duke of Grafton	Duke of Grafton	Lord Rockingham	Lord Rockingham	Lord Rockingham	Lord Rockingham	Duke of Ancaster
of the Exchequer	Lord North	Lord North	Charles Townshend	W. Dowdeswell	W. Dowdeswell	W. Dowdeswell	W. Dowdeswell	Lord North
of the Treasury	C. Jenkinson	Pryse Campbell	Pryse Campbell	Lord J. Cavendish	Lord J. Cavendish	Lord J. Cavendish	Lord J. Cavendish	C. Jenkinson
Secretaries, Id.	George Onslow	C. Jenkinson	George Onslow	Thomas Townshend	Thomas Townshend	Thomas Townshend	Thomas Townshend	C. Jenkinson
of the Admiralty	Grey Cooper	George Onslow	George Onslow	Charles Lowndes	Charles Lowndes	Charles Lowndes	Charles Lowndes	Grey Cooper
of the State	John Robinson	Grey Cooper	Grey Cooper	Grey Cooper	Grey Cooper	Grey Cooper	Grey Cooper	John Robinson
of the Northern Department	Lord Sandwich	Thomas Bradshaw	Thomas Bradshaw	Lord Egmont	Lord Egmont	Lord Egmont	Lord Egmont	Thomas Bradshaw
of the Colonies	Ld. Sandwich, Ld. Halifax, &c.	Sir Edward Hawke	Sir Edward Hawke	General Conway	General Conway	General Conway	General Conway	Sir Edward Hawke
of the Admiralty	Ld. Weymouth, Ld. Suffolk, &c.	Lord Weymouth	Lord Weymouth	Duke of Grafton	Duke of Grafton	Duke of Grafton	Duke of Grafton	Lord Weymouth
of the Navy	Lord Hillsborough	Lord Hillsborough	Lord Hillsborough	Lord Besborough	Lord Besborough	Lord Besborough	Lord Besborough	Lord Hillsborough
of Ireland	Lord Carteret	Lord Hillsborough	Lord Hillsborough	Lord Grantham	Lord Grantham	Lord Grantham	Lord Grantham	Lord Carteret
of the Treasury	Lord le Despencer	Lord le Despencer	Lord le Despencer	Lord Granby	Lord Granby	Lord Granby	Lord Granby	Lord le Despencer
of Ordnance	Lord Granby	Lord Granby	Lord Granby	Lord Barrington	Lord Barrington	Lord Barrington	Lord Barrington	Lord Granby
Secretary at War	R. Rigby	R. Rigby	R. Rigby	Ld. North and Geo. Cooke	Ld. North and Geo. Cooke	Ld. North and Geo. Cooke	Ld. North and Geo. Cooke	R. Rigby
Secretary of Trade	Lord Hillsborough	Lord Hillsborough	Lord Hillsborough	Lord Dartmouth	Lord Dartmouth	Lord Dartmouth	Lord Dartmouth	Lord Hillsborough
Secretary of the Navy	Sir G. Elliot	Lord Howe	Lord Howe	Lord Howe	Lord Howe	Lord Howe	Lord Howe	Sir G. Elliot
of the Admiralty	Lord Townshend	Lord Townshend	Lord Townshend	Lord Hertford	Lord Hertford	Lord Hertford	Lord Hertford	Lord Townshend
of Ireland	Lord Clare	Isaac Barré	Isaac Barré	James Oswald	James Oswald	James Oswald	James Oswald	Lord Clare
of the Treasury	Lord Cornwallis	James Grenville	James Grenville	Lord Geo. Sackville	Lord Geo. Sackville	Lord Geo. Sackville	Lord Geo. Sackville	Lord Cornwallis
of the Admiralty	Welbore Ellis	R. Rigby	Welbore Ellis	Welbore Ellis	Welbore Ellis	Welbore Ellis	Welbore Ellis	Welbore Ellis

* † See Memoranda at the back of this page.

MEMORANDA

TO THE LIST OF THE DIFFERENT CHANGES OF THE MINISTRY.

* Lord George Sackville, Master General of the Ordnance, Commander-in-Chief, Deputy Ranger of the Phoenix Park, Dublin, &c. &c. dismissed from his Majesty's service August 10, 1759.

† July, 1765, Lord George Sackville was sworn a Member of the Privy Council, and appointed one of the Vice Treasurers of Ireland; removed 1766, the new Ministry objecting to his taking a part in the Administration on the ground of the censure of the Court Martial being still in force against him. Held no place under Government until the year 1775, when he was appointed Secretary of State for the Colonies and First Lord of Trade and Plantations. During this interval the Letters of Junius were written.

CHAPTER III.

MEMOIRS OF LORD VISCOUNT SACKVILLE.

IF high birth, elevated situation, eminent talents, or great riches; if qualities which adorn life and command esteem, with various and striking vicissitudes of fortune, be sufficient to claim distinction and excite enquiry; no person is more entitled to be commemorated than Lord Viscount Sackville. He was the third son of Lionel, first Duke of Dorset, by Elizabeth, daughter of Lieutenant-General Colyear. His lordship was born June 26, 1716, in the Haymarket, where his father at that time resided. He received his name from King George the First, who was his godfather, and who honoured the ceremony of his baptism by his personal presence.

The early part of his education he received at Westminster school, where he distinguished himself with other young noblemen and gentlemen, by reciting verses both in Latin and English on the Coronation of King George the Second and Queen Caroline, on the 18th February 1728, the inauguration day of Queen Elizabeth. At this period he was only eleven

years and a half old. The following is a true copy of the Latin verse which he wrote on that occasion :—

“ Delicium et caput Angliacæ, Gulielme, juventæ,
 Carmine te tenui Musa coëva canit.
 Spes cresce in nostras et tu, si justa benignum
 Respiciant cœlum vota, Glovernīs eris.
 Hunc rapuit Puerum mors immatura ; Britannæ
 Tu decus esto puer gentis, et esto senex.”

His inquisitive mind soon became stored, not only with useful information, but he was thoroughly grounded in the classics. Naturally endowed with a strong memory, he rarely forgot circumstances and events that attracted his attention. English History was his delight, and he passed all his examinations with credit to himself and his instructors. On entering his fourteenth year, he left the school to accompany his father, the Duke of Dorset, to Ireland, who was appointed Lord Lieutenant of that country in 1730. Probably to ingratiate himself with the Hibernians, the Duke determined on finishing the education of his third son, Lord George, at Trinity College, Dublin, where he accordingly was placed under the tuition of Dr. Whitcombe and Mr. Molloy, the one a senior, the other a junior fellow of that Institution. Our young student soon made a rapid proficiency in litera-

ture, and he quitted the University with great reputation.

The Iliad had inspired his ardent mind with a desire of performing achievements similar to the heroes of old, and he accordingly determined to devote his life to the service of his country. By nature courageous, endowed with a high sense of honour, and a temper at times impetuous, he was better suited for the field than for domestic employment; he accordingly persevered in his resolution, and on the 11th July 1737, he obtained a commission. The following year he accompanied his father to Paris, where he acquired a thorough knowledge of the French language. On the 19th July 1740, he was appointed Lieutenant-Colonel of General Philip Bragge's regiment*. In 1742 he accompanied his sovereign George the Second, to Hanover; and on June 27th, 1743, he distinguished himself at the battle of Dettingen, where the King commanded in person; the 9th of July following, he was declared one of his Majesty's aid-de-camps.

He served in the campaign of 1744, and at the battle of Fontenoy, which took place that year, was wounded in the breast by a musket-ball, and thrown upon a waggon with many others. He preserved the uniform which he wore

* Viz. the 28th regiment of foot.

that day, bearing on it the mark of the ball, and other holes in the skirt of the coat, perforated by bullets.

He returned home with some of the wounded to recruit, leaving his sovereign and the Duke of Cumberland to pay their visit to the Emperor, who was then residing at Frankfort, in extreme penury.

Lord George remained for some time at his town residence, Whitehall, during which period the Rebellion broke out in Scotland. Charles Edward, the son of the Pretender, who was then residing at the French Court, took advantage of the King's absence, to turn his attention towards Scotland, and make one more effort to regain the throne of his ancestors.

Many of the Scotch nobility who were disloyal to the House of Hanover, espoused his cause, and on the 22d June 1745, Charles Edward landed in one of the Orkney Islands. He continued to gain adherents, and rapidly pushed on to Edinburgh, which immediately surrendered. The Parliament became alarmed; suspended the Habeas Corpus Act, and offered a large reward for Charles Edward's head. The shops and Bank were shut; the minds of the people in the utmost consternation. From the commencement of the Rebellion, Lord George received accounts of what was passing, through

his intimate friend Major Younge, who was at that time stationed in the North. The Major compliments him so far as to wish him to be present to take the command. In reply, he tells his friend, that if the King should appoint him to join the army, he would be conferring a greater honour than pleasure to him, not being desirous to visit a country to which he was by no means partial. The following letter, written at this eventful period, possesses considerable interest.

“ Whitehall, Jan. 18th, 1745.

“ DEAR YOUNGE,

“ You are very good in writing to me when I so little deserve it, by not answering your last letter; but if you knew the hurry every body was in that had anything to do with the army, you would not be surprised at their neglecting to do, what their inclination would otherwise have led them to have done. We are in great hopes of soon hearing good news from Mr. Hawley; nobody doubts his abilities, consequently, we flatter ourselves that he will meet with success, and I hope that the dragoons will recover their reputation. Our fears of an invasion are almost entirely laid aside; and as we are apt to go from one extreme to the other, we are already thinking what regiments are to

be sent abroad ; there is not the least doubt of ten thousand men going, if the rebels in the north do not grow more formidable than they are at present. Our parliamentary affairs are likely to be carried on with greater unanimity than was expected a week ago. The opposition began to look big, but Mr. Pitt, Mr. Littleton, the Grenvilles, and several others, instead of joining in it, as it was imagined they intended, supported the ministry in the address to the King ; so that Mr. Hume Campbell, Sir Watkin Williams, &c., making in the whole but 53 against 279, were the only persons that gave any obstruction to what was proposed. I am obliged to you for wishing me at the head of the regiment in your neighbourhood. I cannot say I am solicitous about it ; if the king pleases to give it me, I must accept of it with thankfulness, but as I have already the rank of colonel, *il me fera plus d'honneur que de plaisir*. Among the many candidates that have been named for it, I have not yet heard the Lieutenant-Colonel mentioned, and I believe it would not have escaped my knowledge, if any application in his favour had reached his Majesty. There is another regiment vacant by the death of Brigadier Lowther. We had, yesterday, a little debate in the House of Commons, occasioned by a motion of Lord Cornbury's, and seconded by Sir

Francis Dashwood, to address the King to lay before the House all instances made by the States-General, as far as related to the security of the Netherlands; but his Lordship had the mortification to see his motion rejected by 163 to 73. Your friends of the regiment are all well, and at Kingston, Richmond, &c., and, I believe, do not envy your situation in the North. *J'ai l'honneur d'être, avec toute la consideration possible, mon cher Monsieur,*

“ *Votre très humble et fidele Serviteur,*

“ *GEO. SACKVILLE.*”

“ *To Captain Younge,
of Colonel Ligonier's Dragoons, at Berwick-on-Tweed.*”

A short time afterwards Lord Ligonier was removed from the command; which subject is mentioned by Lord George in the next letter; wherein the reader will perceive that he spoke with confidence as to an intimate knowledge of the transaction, so characteristic in Junius's reply to Sir. W. Draper.

“ *Whitehall, Feb. 8, 1745-6.*

“ *DEAR YOUNGE,*

“ *I SHOULD have returned you my thanks sooner for the account you sent me of the late affair at Falkirk, if I had known that your regiment was to have been left at Edinburgh,*

when the Duke advanced towards the rebels. Your account was more satisfactory than any I have read, and I think I understand by it the true cause of the event of that day. We are greatly pleased with the precipitate retreat of the rebels from Stirling; and it is generally believed that they will soon disperse, though the French have a mind, I suppose, to keep up their spirits, by ordering the embarkation made at Ostend, of about fifteen hundred of the Irish brigade, to sail at all events. Your friends at Brussels are in a melancholy situation, though the resistance they have hitherto made is more than I expected from them. The garrison consists of seventeen battalions, and some squadrons; they say they have made a sortie with success, but the enemy is too nearly advanced to their works to hope for a much longer defence; the covered way has already been attacked, but Messieurs les François were repulsed with the loss of 180 men. The Comte de Saxe thought to have been master of the town in four or five days, as appears by an intercepted letter from an engineer: he complains of their not being provided with necessaries for a siege, as they could not expect any resistance equal to what they have met with, and ends by saying that it would be an affair of, at least, a fortnight. The Prince of Waldeck is collecting what troops

he can, and if the town holds out till the arrival of the Austrian troops (which were expected at Antwerp as yesterday, to the number of 10,000), the Prince says, he will endeavour to relieve the town. The French give out they are 50,000 strong: it is thought they really were 30,000, but are already considerably diminished by sickness and desertion; so that I should hope it would not be impossible to attack them with success, though I greatly fear Brussels will have surrendered before the experiment can be made. If the Hessians had but staid in Flanders, it would have been of the greatest advantage, and surely they will only be troublesome to you in Scotland. We remain still in the same uncertainty about the part we are to take upon the continent. If we receive good news from Brussels, I dare say we should do something immediately, but if that garrison, consisting of the best part of the Dutch army, should be lost, I know not what submissions and conditions the French would impose upon the Dutch that they would not, with thankfulness, receive. It was strongly reported the other day that Stanhope had got the regiment of foot, late Ligonier's, and my Lord Harrington's people gave it out as a thing not only consented to, but done; upon inquiry, no orders have yet been given about it; and I did not think it

very likely a regiment should be disposed of, till his royal highness had, at least, approved ; so that I suppose, Stanhope, if he is to get it, will stay till the other regiments are given. I had the honour of being at a ball at my Lady Rochford's just before the Duke left London : it was one of the best I ever saw, and I was much obliged to Madame la Comtesse for being admitted.

“ I am, dear Younge,

“ Your faithful Servant,

“ GEO. SACKVILLE.”

“ What is the story about Major Lockart ?”

“ To Captain Thomas Younge,
of the Regiment of Dragoons, late Colonel Ligonier's,
at Edinburgh, North Britain.

(“ Free,—GEO. SACKVILLE.”)

General Cope's disaster at Preston-Pans next claims his attention, and is fully commented upon to his friend.

“ Whitehall, October 29th, 1745.

“ DEAR YOUNGE,

“ I AM extremely obliged to you for your letter: though wrote to me in English, it must have been, to judge of it by its politeness, translated from the French. You know enough of me to remember that I am not given to com-

pliments, so that I must content myself in telling you I am greatly pleased in still having a place in your thoughts, and that I most heartily congratulate you on your escape in that fatal day to this country. Who has been to blame, time must shew; the General is suspected of want of conduct, those nearest to him in command not entirely cleared as yet in the minds of the people, but all agree in the scandalous and base behaviour of the private men, and at the same time do justice to the courage and resolution of their officers, after they were abandoned in so shameful a manner. The whole affair is to be inquired into, and if any are guilty, I trust they will be punished; but that will be but poor satisfaction. The letter you wrote from Edinburgh, never reached me, and that to Wright most probably met with the same fate. Rectè is now Captain Lieutenant, and upon crutches; he was shot through the foot at Fontenoi, and though he has saved his leg, he has not yet much use of it. Jocelyn is well, and at Dartford encamped; I came from thence on Sunday pour briller à la cour demain. Captain Saily is just arrived from captivity; his wounds are well, but his beauty rather decreased. The rest of your friends go on as usual, but we have many new faces among us since turnip gathering was your

trade. The attention of every body is entirely upon the North, and we wait with great impatience to see the effect the arrival of Marshal Wade in that country will have upon the rebels. By their not yet having marched southward, it seems as if they had laid the thoughts of it aside. Some go so far as to imagine that they will retire towards the Highlands upon his approach, without venturing a battle, but I think as their force is not equal to whatever they can hope hereafter to draw together, that they will engage him at all events; and if they should have success, God knows what the consequence would be. France would not then delay a moment the making a division in some part of England,—their coast is crowded with troops, and there are now above forty sail of small vessels at Dunkirk, which may be designed for an embarkation. The House of Commons sat yesterday till seven o'clock; Mr. Hume Campbell and Mr. Pitt moved for enquiring immediately into the causes of the progress of the rebels, but the motion was thought a little premature, as the truth of those affairs was not so easily come at during the rebellion; so that upon the division the motion was rejected by 194 to 112. We have had the misfortune of losing a sixty-gun ship, with all her crew, upon the coast of France towards Brest; it is supposed to be the York man-

of-war: she was giving chase to eleven French merchant-men, convoyed by two frigates. They all went too near the shore, and the wind blowing full upon it, none of them escaped, and not a Frenchman or an Englishman was saved. I hope soon to hear some good news from you, and that Messieurs les Dragoons have retrieved their honour. By my saying nothing of myself you may conclude that I have no complaints.

“ I am, dear Younge,

“ Your’s very sincerely,

“ GEORGE SACKVILLE.”

On the 11th September, the King, accompanied by the Duke of Cumberland, returned home from Germany; and as the accounts from the North became daily more unfavourable, it was determined that the Duke of Cumberland should proceed forthwith to take the command of the army. Lord George Sackville accompanied him, and on the 10th February 1746, they arrived in the neighbourhood of Edinburgh, of which they soon regained possession. Leaving a sufficient garrison in the city, they pushed on to Stirling Castle, Falkirk, and Inverness; after encountering great fatigue and harassing marches, they came up to the Pretender at Culloden, where the fate of that unfortunate Prince was decided. Here Lord George greatly dis-

tinguished himself, and as a testimony of the Duke's approbation of his conduct, he was promoted Colonel of the 20th regiment. He was afterwards dispatched to Perth during the absence of Major-General Skelton, where he held the responsible situation of commander-in-chief of his Majesty's forces. At this period he was in the thirtieth year of his age.

From Perth, he writes the following letter, wherein he declares that nothing but another Rebellion would ever tempt him to visit those Northern Hills again.

“ Perth, October 6th, 1746.

“ DEAR YOUNGE,

“ THE letter from your cell at Aire was not received as soon as it ought to have been by some days. If you had been a man of this world instead of a hermit, you might have heard that instead of my being at Dundee with my own regiment, I was in the great and elevated situation of Commander of his Majesty's forces in Perth. Major-General Skelton having, or pretending to have, business in England, so that till his return I have the honour to supply his place. *Haud equidem tali me dignor honore.* I should not have made use of Latin words but in compliment to *socios habuisse dolores.* I take for granted you have recourse to any other lan-

guage rather than French, thinking my criticisms extend to no other, *et il faut avouer que Monsieur ait raison*. I must confess, that although I should not receive with the least reluctance an order to repair to London, yet I am not fashionable enough to be miserable in my present situation, remote as it is from those I am used to live with, and different as the country and the climate are from those I might expect to be in. I do not pretend to much philosophy, but the maxim I have laid down, and have hitherto constantly pursued, is to compare my situation with what it might have been, and myself with those who have much greater reason to complain than I have; not envying those who are more fortunate and ought to be more happy. Possibly this letter may find you removed from Aire, and probably upon your march to England. As Captain of Dragoons I condole with you upon the change, but as Mr. Younge, I must congratulate you, for when you are settled in quarters, the gulf between you and London may easily be passed, *et peut-être j'aurai l'honneur en deux mois d'ici de vous voir briller chez Madame l'Ambassatrice de Venice*; but let me advise you to prepare yourself for the affront of being taken for a foreigner by every body that is not acquainted with you. The stay I am to make in this country is yet uncertain; the 18th of November the Parliament meets. If

members are wanted I suppose we shall be sent for, the beginning of next month. If business is likely to go on quietly, they may possibly not care to give us the trouble of so long a journey—*Quant à moi je suis content.* My present motto is, *in utrumque paratus*, and all I pray for is that I may never have occasion any more to visit those Northern Hills, for I think nothing but a Rebellion can ever call me there again. An acquaintance of yours bears me company in this place, *Cunninghame* * is his name, if that is not sufficient to call him to your remembrance, *il a une sœur au Chateau de Stirling qui n'est pas laide.* He expects by every post to hear that he is in my regiment, and I believe you will think he is no bad recruit. You will forgive the length of this stupid letter, but it is a fault I am not often guilty of, therefore I may expect to have it the easier excused, for I could in much fewer words have assured you of my regard and esteem for you, and my sincere wishes for your happiness wherever you go, and whatever you undertake.—*Adieu.*

“GEORGE SACKVILLE.”

“To Major Younge.”

The campaign terminating soon after, he gladly left Scotland, and proceeded with his re-

* Afterwards Adjutant-General of Ireland.—See Junius, Vol. II. p. 156.

giment to Dover Castle, where he staid to recruit during the Christmas holidays. From thence he returned home to Whitehall. The following letter, though immaterial in a political point of view, shews that he was a perfect master of the French language. This is also one characteristic trait in Junius, who, in Vol. II. p. 191, criticises the Earl of Rochford's bad French.

“ Whitehall, January 15th, 1747-8.

“ DEAR YOUNGE,

“ I SHOULD have wrote to you sooner had I been in London, but you must know it is now become so fashionable for Colonels to do their own duty, that I have diverted myself, during the holidays, in living with my regiment in Dover Castle; and as I thought dating a letter from thence would not make so good an appearance as dating from Whitehall, I deferred it till I came hither, not that I think I am the least wiser than I was before, or at all entitled to hope for your attention to any news I can send you from hence. Your letter was the best performance of the kind I ever read, and, indeed, I am much obliged to you for it. I dont know whether Cunninghame will say as much, for he never will outlive the name of “ aimable bonbon.” I congratulate with Mr.

Naizon upon your being Major, I wish the prophecy was complete ; but there are so many general officers want to employ the boot-maker in Pall Mall, that I fear it will be a long time before I can have the pleasure of being taken measure of by him ; so, if you please, do not wait for me, but when I see you once in the right road I will make what haste I can to overtake you. De quoi parlerai je ? Les operas ne valent rien, les assemblées ne brillent point jusqu'à present, il ne reste donc que les comedies pour toute ressource, et il faut avouer qu'elles me plaisent, nonobstant que le grand Quin n'est point employé. Quant aux nouvelles, nous n'en avons guerre, les compagnies aux gardes sont toujours vacantes, ceux qui les attendent soupirent, et en peu de tems se crieront d'impatience : si cela arrive, je vous avertirai d'abord que vous puissiez faire valoir vos pretensions. On débite que Milord Anson doit epouser Mademoiselle Yorke, fille de Grand Chancelier ; il ne se porte pas bien à present, et la Demoiselle s'impatiente, qu'il ne se trouve pas encore en état de bander comme un Carme. Qu'avez vous fait, mon cher Major, que vos amis sont privés si long tems de votre compagnie ? Vous avez trouvés peut-être des charmes invincibles en Ecosse que vous fassent oublier vos autres attachemens. L'amour ne se borne point aux pays fer-

tiles, il se retire souvent aux montagnes, et se pique même de soumettre des sauvages à son empire—si en chemin faisant il vous a rencontré, ne s'est il pas arrêté un peu à rallumer le feu dans un cœur qui lui a fait tant d'honneur ? mais badiner à part—vous avez été assez long tems auprès de votre regiment, pour demander un congé de quelques mois, venez au plutôt ; autrement vous ne vous trouverez plus au fait des affaires, et bien des nouvelles modes seront passées avant que vous les ayez donnés votre approbation. Your old acquaintance, Colonel Howard, is going to be married to Lady Lucy Wentworth. Conway has pretty well recovered his looks. My Lady Ailesbury still looks fatigued. God knows what they have been doing together. It is expected the Duke will soon think of returning to the army. We have had no letters from Holland for some days, so we do not know whether the French have attempted anything. My regiment is to have the happiness of serving abroad this year, we envy you that indulge in ease and plenty, you must pretend to envy us for the honour we attempt to gain. When I last heard from poor Jocelyn, he was rather better ; he still flatters himself with the hopes of being able to serve this campaign, but I want faith. I think you ought to be ashamed to suffer a lieutenant of foot to be

in possession of the best thing in Stirling Castle. You Field-Officers are so wise and cautious that you will not marry, without a woman brings a great sum of money along with her. Some people say I am wrong to attribute it to prudence, and insist upon it that your caution proceeds from want of vigour. Though you may want vigour it is no reason you should not want patience, and I am sure I have tried yours so sufficiently, that if my modesty does not, at least my paper forces me to release you, with only just room to assure you how sincerely I am

“ Your faithful servant,

“ GEO. SACKVILLE.”

“ To Major Younge,

‘ of Colonel Naizon’s Regiment of Dragoons,

at Kilmarnock, North Britain.”

(“ Free,—GEO. SACKVILLE.”)

In the two ensuing campaigns of 1747 and 1748, he again accompanied the Duke of Cumberland to the Continent, who, during the negotiation for a peace, sent him to the head quarters of the French camp to confer with Marshal Saxe, one of the greatest generals of the age, and to conclude a general armistice between both parties; which having effected, he went with a French General Officer to Maestricht, and after settling the other preliminaries, he returned to the English camp, having performed

his mission with great credit to himself, and satisfaction to the Duke. The preliminaries were signed at Aix-la-Chapelle. On his return home he took his seat in parliament, as member for Dover, although the family were in possession of boroughs of their own. The first speech we have recorded in Cobbett's Parliamentary Debates was in the year 1750, on a clause in the Mutiny Bill, which evinces great talent, and a thorough knowledge of all the points he spoke to. Nov. 1, 1749, he was promoted to be Colonel of the 12th Regiment of Dragoons, and in Jan. 13th, 1750, Colonel of the King's Regiment of Horse Carboneers in Ireland. The following year, 1751, he went over to Ireland, in the capacity of secretary to his father, the Duke of Dorset, who was again appointed Lord-Lieutenant.

His influence in that country is already noticed by copious extracts from Lord Orford's Memoirs. A quarrel ensuing between their administration and the Irish parliament, he became disgusted and never went over afterwards.

Aug. 3, 1754, he married Miss Diana Sambrooke, of Dover Street, Piccadilly. She was second daughter, and co-heir of John Sambrooke, Esq. only brother of Sir Jeremy Sambrooke, of Gibbons in Hertfordshire, Baronet. By her he had two sons, Charles and George :

and three daughters, Diana, Elizabeth and Caroline.

Feb. 22d, 1755, he was promoted to the rank of Major-General. On the breaking out of the war in 1756, he accompanied the Duke of Marlborough to the coast of Normandy and Brittany, when we bombarded St. Malo's, and demolished Cherburgh.

In the spring of 1757 he commanded the detachment of troops stationed at Biggleswade, in Hertfordshire, and in the autumn of the same year, he commanded the camp near Chatham and Brompton in Kent; at which period, Captain Smith, father to the present Sir Sydney Smith, was his aid-de-camp.

During this encampment, Mr. Whitfield came to Chatham to offer his spiritual services to the soldiers. Captain Smith brought the following message to his Lordship from that primitive apostle: "My Lord, Mr. Whitfield is come hither; he sends his respects, by me, to your Lordship, and requests that he may have your permission to preach in the camp." Lord George replied, "Make my compliments, Mr. Smith, to Mr. Whitfield, and tell him from me, that he may preach any thing to my soldiers, that is not contrary to the Articles of War."* This little

* Stockdale's Memoirs.

anecdote shews the liberality of Lord George's sentiments, who, though a strict disciplinarian, was willing to relieve Mr. Whitfield's mind, and to have religious instruction imparted to his soldiers. Marshal Saxe, Marshal Turenne, or General Suwarrow would not have allowed an itinerant preacher to have unsettled the minds of their soldiers with any new doctrine, although Mr. Whitfield's opinions, like those of Mahomet, were best calculated for the field of battle. The camp broke up soon afterwards.

At the close of the year an armament was sent against Rochfort, which proving unsuccessful, the clamours of the people rendered an inquiry into the conduct of the commander, Sir John Mordaunt, a necessary measure. On this occasion, Lord George Sackville, the Duke of Marlborough, and General Waldegrave were appointed to inquire into, and report their opinion of, the cause of the failure; the decision tending rather to criminate than discharge the culprit, he demanded a court-martial, which, to the surprise of the public, found him not guilty.

On the 26th Jan. 1758, Lord George was nominated Lieutenant-General of his Majesty's forces, Lieutenant-General of the Ordnance, and sworn a member of the Privy Council. At the close of this year he accompanied the Duke of Marlborough to Germany, and on the

demise of the Duke, which took place at Munster, on the Lower Rhine, he took the command of the British forces. The succeeding year, 1759, was fought the famous battle of Minden, which proved fatal to the reputation of his Lordship, through the jealousy of Prince Ferdinand. The Prince soon found that the extensive understanding, superior talent, and inquisitive spirit of Lord George, which could neither be deceived, dazzled, nor soothed into tame acquiescence, were incompatible with his views. The Duke of Marlborough and Lord Granby were Prince Ferdinand's friends. Not so, Lord George; they cordially hated each other. By adhering tenaciously to opinions he conceived well-founded, and exhibiting many marks of an active and inquisitive disposition, he had already rendered himself so great an enemy to the Prince, that it was thought nothing was more eagerly desired than an opportunity of removing him from the high station he filled. This opportunity was finally accomplished at the battle of Minden. At the close of that eventful day, so unconscious was Lord George of any act of cowardice on his part, that he went to Prince Ferdinand's camp to dine with the rest of the British officers. On his entrance, the Prince remarked to Colonel Fitzroy, "*Voici cet homme à son aise, comme s'il avoit fait de merveilles.*"

The particulars of this affair, which afterwards occasioned greater political dissensions in the country than the war itself, are so ably summed up by Lord Orford that we need not enlarge much farther. To shew how conscious he was of his own innocence, and in vindication of the imputations ungenerously thrown upon his character, he writes to his brother-in-law, Lord Viscount Bateman, as follows, wherein he takes an opportunity of expressing his surprise at so dangerous an exertion of the prerogative, which was not only without precedent in history, but contrary to the established laws of a free government.

‘ Pall Mall, Sept. 18th, 1759. ’

“ MY DEAR LORD,

“ I AM infinitely obliged to you for the very kind manner in which you express yourself upon my subject. I am persuaded your good nature would make you pity any indifferent person in my situation, and I have received too many assurances of your friendship for me to doubt of your interesting yourself most sincerely in my bringing this strange story to light, and in shewing myself entirely free from the imputations so indirectly thrown upon my character.

“ I beg you will thank Lady Bateman for her goodness to me upon this occasion, though I

cannot compliment her so far as to think that she could bear such a misfortune with half the spirit her sister has done.

“ I must live in hopes of better times. If under all the disadvantages of being prejudged by the King, in being dismissed from my employments before trial, and under the popular prejudice I now stand, I could obtain a court-martial, I flatter myself, I must be acquitted; and if that happens to me, no officer can have a fuller justification, because every motive but that of justice must weigh against me.

“ I heartily wish that as this is the first, so it may be the last instance of such an exertion of the prerogative: if it were to be drawn into precedent, I fear the army would not be a profession so sought after by persons either of rank or fortune.

“ Many people conceive it impossible for me to be tried, now I am absolutely out of the army, but I believe the best authorities in the law think I may.

“ I know the use they will make of this, will be to frighten the officers of Militia, by shewing them, that ten years hence they may be accountable for any crime supposed to have been committed whilst they were under military law: but seriously speaking, I do hear

that difficulty is started in conversation, and I only wish it may not alarm.

“ I am, my dear Lord,

“ Your faithful humble Servant,

“ GEO. SACKVILLE.”

“ To Lord Viscount Bateman.”

In justice to his Lordship's memory, I may here state, after thoroughly investigating the particulars, that I consider him to have been an injured man, and therefore take this opportunity of coinciding with Mr. Stockdale, who was well acquainted with him. Having left the army long before this period he could have no sinister views in espousing his cause; he has given us so undisguised a testimony in favour of his Lordship's reputation that I cannot pass it over in silence.

“ As my own faults,” says Mr. Stockdale, “ great and numerous as they are, have been aggravated, and my good endeavours undervalued and traduced by malice, I seize every fair opportunity, with a particular zeal, to do justice, as far as my limited power goes, to distinguished and injured merit, living or departed. Consistently with this disposition and habits, I must beg leave to offer a generous and grateful, but equitable tribute to the memory of the unfortunate, for I cannot call him

the criminal, Lord George Sackville, afterwards Lord George Germain, who, in the year 1757, commanded our camp near Chatham and Brompton, in Kent. I said a grateful tribute, for he endeavoured essentially to befriend me, twenty-three years after that encampment; and with a degree of magnanimous generosity, when we consider that honest, virtuous, and bold truths are seldom pardoned by the great. I dedicated my defence of Pope to him. My dedication was short, independent, and manly. I took notice of the strong and fair claim which he had, on his own account, and on that of his ancestors, to a public tribute from a zealous asserter of the high poetical merit and fame of Pope. To shew the disinterested respect, which, as a scholar and a writer, I bore to his Lordship, I openly reprobated the American War, over which he, at that time, politically presided. This frankness was so far from disgusting him against me, that he afterwards set his interest in motion to befriend me in Jamaica; some adverse circumstances prevented me from availing myself of his kindness. But what a singular example have we here, of a statesman, of a person high in power, who was so far from being offended at the downright sincerity of a poor unprotected man, who condemned his plans, who disapproved his own ambition, that

he wished to reward it ! *He was a brave and honourable man, but he was iniquitously and basely treated.* It must be well known to all the surviving friends and acquaintances of that unfortunate nobleman, that he bore the insults of the vulgar, and the coldness and taunts of those who were equal or superior to him in situation, with a calm and unshaken fortitude. Not a less powerful auxiliary than conscience could have inspired and supported this equanimity under such trying circumstances. The valour of his philosophy in the region of envy and malevolence, must certainly have been preceded by his collected mind in the field of Mars. The calmness and serenity, the politeness of manner of which he was master when he fought a duel with Governor Johnstone, in 1770, for a sarcasm allusive to Minden, will be a decisive proof of what I am now advancing, with every unprejudiced and generous man. But his behaviour at a more solemn and awful crisis, even in the last extremity of nature, will, I should think, be an unexceptionable, an irresistible voucher for his courage and firmness in the day of battle.

I was a young clergyman in London when Lord George Sackville was tried by a general Court-Martial. I was on the most friendly terms with my old brother officers, and I often visited those who were at that time in the metropolis. I had

the honour to be well acquainted with Captain Smith, father to Sir Sydney Smith, who was aid-de-camp to Lord George at Brompton, and at the battle of Minden. He was a man of sense and spirit; a man of a warm, generous, and sincere heart, with whom no consideration upon earth could ever prevail to suppress the truth, when he thought that it was his duty to declare it. His testimony at the Court-Martial in favour of his noble friend, was unreserved, explicit, and ardent. However impartial he was, he must have been ardent on that obnoxious occasion. But his honesty did him no good. Walking with him, one day, along Wych Street, we resumed the memorable subject. I seriously asked him, if it was his real opinion that the conduct of Lord George Sackville deserved no censure on the Minden day? He emphatically answered, that 'his conduct on that day was perfectly accurate, and what it ought to have been; and that he merited no more blame, as a soldier, than *that* child,' pointing to a little flaxen-headed boy that passed as we conversed.

"I asked Mr. Smith, if he did not advance too slowly when he *did* march? He insisted, 'that he could not, circumstanced as he was, march faster;' and he gave me clear and satisfactory reasons for that assertion. He added, 'that the orders which were brought to Lord George,

by Prince Ferdinand's aid-de-camps were contradictory to each other, confused, and consequently embarrassing to any man.' He further observed, that 'when he rode himself to Prince Ferdinand to get an explanation, he was exposed to more danger than he would have been in the pursuit of the French.'

“ I lately had the honour of conversing with my Lord Grey, on this important subject. He not only acquitted Lord Sackville of the least misconduct at the battle of Minden, but spoke with great respect of his general character. A predestinarian would say, that Lord Sackville was fated to be unfortunate both in his military and political capacity. Long after the war in Germany, he presided over a more unjustifiable war on the continent of America.

“ As Lord Sackville was a person of high rank, and had all the advantages of education, it is almost superfluous for me to say, that he was a polite man. He was tall and well formed: he had an elegance—a dignity of deportment. He was conversant with books and men: he was eloquent in the Senate: and eloquent, often poignant, in conversation.”

This undisguised sketch of his Lordship's character, and impartial testimony in favour of his reputation, added to various other accounts which I have repeatedly seen in connection

with his fall, convince me, that the proceedings of that Court-Martial ought to be officially repealed: it being a disgrace to the integrity and honour of this country for that sentence to remain on record, while it has been virtually disavowed by the late king in creating his lordship a peer of the realm. It is altogether different to a bill of attainder, which subjects the whole family to a confiscation of their estates. Honour is a more valuable treasure than gold, or even than life itself:

Good name, in man and woman, dear my lord,
Is the immediate jewel of their souls.

Who steals my purse, steals trash; 'tis something, nothing;
'Twas mine, 'tis his, and has been slave to thousands;
But he that filches from me my good name,
Robs me of that which not enriches him,
And makes me poor indeed.

OTHELLO.

At the accession of George the Third in 1760, Lord George appeared at Court. This was considered so great an indignity to the memory of the late king, and those ministers who had the management of the German war, that an enquiry was set on foot to ascertain who invited him. It was traced to Lord Bute, who was officially informed, that such an invitation was a great breach of decorum. The same was signified to Lord George, who was highly

indignant at being thus made the dupe of Lord Bute and the ministry: he never went afterwards during that administration. This circumstance is mentioned in the sacred No. 45 of the North Briton, which was published a considerable time after the event took place*. Although couched in mysterious language, it is evident that the drift of the libel was aimed at Lord Bute for his duplicity. Lord George alludes to this number in his speech on the impeachment of Lord Mansfield. Junius, it appears, occasionally contributed to that popular publication, by his private letter to Mr. Woodfall, No. 34.—“ If, for any reasons that do not occur to me, you should think it unadvisable to print it as it stands, I must intreat the favour of you to transmit it to Bingley, and satisfy him that it is a real Junius, worth a North Briton extraordinary.” It is worthy of remark that the North Briton and Junius both appeared after Lord George’s fall, and that the object of both was to satirize the King and the ministry, with much personal invective. At this period Lord George retired for a time to his paternal mansion at Knole in Kent, being evidently aware of the jealousy of government towards him, which is confirmed by the precaution he took in forwarding some

* In 1763.

papers to his friend Colonel Cunninghame, through the medium of Sir Robert Wilmot.

“Knole, Sept. 30th, 1760.

“DEAR SIR,

“I should be obliged by your sending the enclosed papers to Mr. Waite, to be delivered to Colonel Cunninghame. There is nothing contained in them but accounts relating to General Bragg’s affairs: I have not even added a line to Cunninghame, that you might not have it upon your conscience the having conveyed through the channel of government any correspondence of

“Your faithful Servant,

“GEORGE SACKVILLE.”

“To Sir Robert Wilmot.”

From the year 1760 to 1765 there is an interregnum in his lordship’s public life. Although Member of Parliament for Hythe, yet we find by the journals of the House that he took no active part in the discussions, there being but one speech recorded during this long period. On that occasion he observed, “he bled to see his country in such a calamitous situation,” which evinced the keenness of his feelings and that he secretly watched the proceedings of government. In 1765 he was nominated a member of the

Privy Council, and appointed one of the vice-treasurers of Ireland. This gave him an opportunity of knowing every minute circumstance connected with Irish affairs, all the movements of the ministry, all that was passing in the immediate circle of the court, as well as in the various departments of the law, the army, the navy, or foreign affairs.

In 1769, by the will of Lady Betty Germain, he came into possession of personal property amounting to upwards of 20,000*l.*, in addition to very valuable estates at Drayton in Northamptonshire, upon taking possession of which he dropped the name of Sackville, and took her ladyship's name. As Lady Betty Germain appears to have been no relation, it seems natural to enquire how Lord George should have claimed her notice, and why she remembered him in so liberal a manner, unless it were the circumstance of his being deprived of all his emoluments under government. Her ladyship was endowed with good abilities, which she had cultivated with advantage, and being on intimate terms with the family, was partial to Lord George, whose talents and conversation she much admired. It also appears from his lordship's own statement to Sir N. Wraxall, that there were prior motives:—

“ Sir John Germain's extraction,” said he,

“ which was uncertain, and variously reported, has given rise to much discussion. His reputed father bore arms, as a private soldier, in the guards of William the Second, Prince of Orange : but his mother, who possessed great personal charms, fame asserted to have been that prince’s mistress : and her son was believed to stand in a very close degree of consanguinity to King William the Third. Other circumstances confirm this opinion. Sir John Germain inherited no paternal coat of arms ; but he assumed, or rather used, as his seal and armorial bearing, a red cross ; meaning thereby probably to imply, that his pretensions ascended higher than his ostensible birth. Even when, by the provisions of his widow, Lady Betty Germain’s will, I inherited Drayton, on the condition of assuming the *name* of Germain, no mention was made of the *arms*, as is customary in almost all similar cases. King William, with whom Sir John came over here from Holland in 1688, unquestionably regarded him with distinguishing affection, and advanced him in life. He became a member of Parliament, received the honour of knighthood, and various pecuniary grants or donations to a considerable amount, were conferred on him by that Prince.

“ Sir John Germain, who possessed a very handsome person, was always a distinguished

favourite of the other sex. His connexion with the Duchess of Norfolk, finally procured him this place and estate, she having married him, after obtaining a divorce from her first husband. They lived together several years; but no children being left alive, and the title of Peterborough having reverted to a collateral branch of the Mordaunt family, she bequeathed to him, by her will, in the year 1705, the house and property of Drayton, which lay entirely in her own disposal. Sir John, who, though naturalized, and become by long residence in this country, in a great degree an Englishman, retained nevertheless many of the habits and particularities of a native of Holland, attached himself much to my mother. She being the daughter of Marshal Colyear, brother to the first Earl of Portmore, who had entered early into the Dutch Service, and who was an old friend of Sir John Germain, he always called her his countrywoman, visited frequently at my father's house, and was kindly received by the Duke and Duchess of Dorset. Finding himself in possession of considerable landed property after the death of his wife, and desirous of transmitting it to his own descendents, but being destitute of any natural connexions, he meditated to engraft himself on some distinguished family of this kingdom. For the pur-

pose, while resident at Bristol Wells, on account of his health, he cast his eyes upon Lady Betty Berkeley, a daughter of the Earl of Berkeley, whose birth, character, and accomplishments, rendered her every way worthy of his choice. She was indeed many years younger than Sir John; but as she possessed a superior understanding, added to the most correct deportment, she acquired great influence over him. Having been, herself, intimate with the Duchess of Dorset, the friendship between the two families became cemented by the alliance. Sir John had several children by her, who all died young; and in the evening of his life, becoming a martyr to the gout, as well as to other diseases, Lady Betty assiduously performed every duty of an affectionate wife and of a careful nurse about his person. A short time before his decease, which happened in the year 1718, having called her to his bedside, ‘Lady Betty,’ said he, ‘I have made you a very indifferent husband, particularly of late years, when infirmities have rendered me a burden to myself; but I shall not be much longer troublesome to you. I advise you never again to marry an old man: but I strenuously exhort you to marry when I am gone, and I will endeavour to put it in your power. You have fulfilled every obligation towards me in an exemplary manner, and I wish

to demonstrate my sense of your merits. I have, therefore, by my will bequeathed you this estate, which I received from my first wife; and which as she gave to me, so I leave to you. I hope you will marry and have children to inherit it. But, if events should determine otherwise, or if you should not have issue to survive you, it would give me pleasure to think, that Drayton descended after your decease to a younger son of my friend the Duchess of Dorset.' In consequence of this wish, expressed by Sir John Germain on his death-bed, I now enjoy the estate. Lady Betty, though young when left a widow, and though she survived him above fifty-years, never married a second time. Her friendship for my mother, always continued without diminution; and her respect for the desire manifested by her husband, induced her to fulfil his wishes, to the exclusion of any of her own relations."

Early in the session of 1770, Lord George again formed a conspicuous figure. His talents as a declaimer, his eloquence as an orator, his sound reasoning and forcible language, soon gained him the applause of the House, although a violent oppositionist to the measures of ministers. His quickness at reply, and his judgment on all important affairs, were so highly thought of by Mr. Pitt that he afterwards styled him the Aga-

memnon of the day ; he convinced by his forcible reasoning, and was feared for his poignancy and satire.

It is remarkable that from the time of his trial in 1760 to the year 1769 (although in the interim he had been introduced as a member of the Privy Council), yet he did not come forward in any public capacity, until soon after the commencement of Junius's Letters, at which time we find him taking a decidedly hostile part in the House of Commons against the existing administration. His speeches abound with the keenest satire, one of which is already given in elucidation of Article XXIII. Although he held no responsible situation under Government, yet he so narrowly watched all its operations, that on the subject of the Money Bill, which was agitated in Parliament in consequence of Lord Townshend's message, he writes to Sir Robert Wilmot for a copy, as follows :

“ Pall Mall, Tuesday Evening, 7 o'clock. ”

“ DEAR SIR,

“ THERE was some conversation yesterday in the House of Lords about the augmentation in Ireland, and I was asked to-day if I knew in what manner the engagement of not sending out of Ireland any of the twelve thousand men (but in certain cases) was mentioned in the Money

Bill. I understood it was a recital of the Lord Lieutenant's message in the preamble to that Bill, and no enacting clause about it.

"If you have any copy of the Bill, I should be glad to see what relates to that particular subject.

"I was sorry I had not the pleasure of seeing you when you were so good as to call upon me. I shall take the first opportunity of waiting upon you.

"I am very sincerely,

"Your faithful,

"Humble servant,

"GEORGE SACKVILLE."

"To Sir Robert Wilmot."

Endorsed—Received 23d Jan. 1770.

From this period to the year 1775, when he became Secretary of State for the American Colonies, he was a hostile opponent to every ministerial measure. During the debate relative to the Falkland Islands, he remarked, that "Ministers had been guilty of more neglect and inattention, than any one would think men, who had any regard for their heads could be capable of. But these men," said he, "have, in fact, no attention whatever to their own characters." His speeches teemed with the same forcible allusions, which gained him many enemies. He fully verified

Horne Tooke's sarcastic remark of being "a thorn in the King's side," and he might have added in the ministers' also, though no one will dispute but that there was sufficient cause at that period, as "Corruption did indeed glitter in the van, and maintain a standing army of mercenaries," who were deaf to the petitions of the people.

On the 14th December 1770, Lord George moved, "That the Speaker do write to such eldest sons and heirs apparent of Peers, Kings, Serjeants, and Masters in Chancery, as are members of this House, and to the Attorney, and Solicitor-General, requesting them to attend in their places every day at two o'clock to assist in carrying Bills to the Lords."—Seconded by Lord George Cavendish.

Among other things in support of his motion Lord George said, that what he had been urging was for the honour of the nation, *in which he did declare he greatly interested himself*. It was thought a very remarkable motion altogether.

Governor Johnstone * in reply, took occasion to say, "that he wondered that noble Lord should interest himself so deeply in the honour of his country, when he had hitherto been so regardless of his own."

These words occasioned a duel, the particu-

* Junius, vol. ii., 474.

lars of which are as follows : Governor Johnstone's speech was not, at the time it was delivered, heard by Lord George Germain ; and he declared he was sorry that he had missed the opportunity of making an instant replication ; but that, however, he would take proper notice of it. On Monday, the 17th December 1770, Governor Johnstone was attending the Committee who were sitting on the petitions relative to the embarkment at Durham-Yard, when Mr. Thomas Townshend* came to him, and desired to speak with him : he took him into another room, when he told him, after making a very polite and gentlemanly excuse as to what share he had in the business he came upon, that the reflection he had cast on the character of Lord George Germain, though not heard by himself at the time, had been communicated to him by his friends ; and that in consequence, Lord George had begged of him to wait on Governor Johnstone to desire that he would retract what he had said ; that for his own part he should be exceedingly sorry to have a quarrel happen between two gentlemen whom he knew, and for whom he had a great respect, and he therefore hoped that to prevent the consequences, Governor Johnstone would retract what he had said respecting Lord George.

* Afterwards Lord Sydney.

The Governor said, it was very true, he had made use of such and such expressions in the House ; that they conveyed his opinion, and that he would maintain and support it. Upon which Mr. Townshend said, in that case, Lord George demanded the satisfaction of a gentleman from him, which the other declared he was ready to give his Lordship at any time. Mr. Townshend then said, Lord George was in an adjoining room, and, if the Governor pleased, they would go to him. The Governor assented ; and Mr. Townshend conveyed him to the room in which Lord George was waiting. Lord George repeated the cause of quarrel, and the demand of satisfaction, which the other acquiesced in, desiring his Lordship would appoint his own time and place. Lord George then mentioned the ring in Hyde Park ; and as in affairs of this kind, all times were alike, the present was, in his opinion, as good a one as any. Governor Johnstone entirely agreed with Lord George as to place ; but said, that as he was now attending his duty in a committee on a subject he had very much at heart, he hoped the meeting Lord George an hour hence would make no difference. Lord George said, no ; and then spoke as to seconds, informing the Governor, at the same time, that he had desired Mr. Townshend to attend him in that light. Governor Johnstone said there was little occa-

sion for seconds, and that therefore Mr. Townshend should stand in that light as to both of them. Governor Johnstone further said, that as he had at that time an open wound in his arm, and his legs very much swelled, he could wish they would use pistols; to which, Lord George saying it was equal to him what the weapons were, they separated, and Governor Johnstone returned to the committee.

In this conference, as well as through the whole affair, both the gentlemen behaved with the greatest politeness to each other, as well as with the greatest courage.

At the appointed hour, Lord George and Mr. Townshend were in the ring; and soon after, Governor Johnstone, accompanied by Sir James Lowther, whom he happened to meet on his way, and had requested to go with him. Lord George accosted Governor Johnstone, and desired he would mention the distance, declaring he was then upon his ground, and the Governor might take what distance he pleased. The Governor was taken back by the seconds about twenty small paces. The antagonists having prepared their pistols, Lord George called on the Governor to fire, which the Governor refused, saying, that as his Lordship brought him there, he must fire first. Upon which Lord George fired, and then the Governor. Neither of the shots took effect.

Lord George then fired his second pistol, and as he was taking down his arm, the Governor's second ball hit his Lordship's pistol, broke some part of it, and one of the splinters grazed his Lordship's hand. The seconds immediately interfered, and the affair was ended. Governor Johnstone afterwards declared to his friends, that in all the affairs of the kind which he ever knew, or was ever concerned in, he never found a man behave with more courage and coolness than Lord George did on this occasion.

This testimony of Governor Johnstone in favour of Lord George's courage, is directly in unison with that of Lord Orford, who knew him well in earlier life. The latter affirms, that he was endowed by nature with a high spirit, a high sense of honour, and undaunted courage. Can we then for a moment suppose that he would shrink from his natural propriety at the battle of Minden, when he had, previous to that event, been among the first to court danger in various other engagements? The tongue of malice is at all times a more formidable enemy than the cannon's mouth. The former inflicts a wound oftentimes incurable; the latter gives a man three chances: that of not injuring him at all, killing him on the spot, or giving him a wound that time is sure to heal.

' The tooth of malice never rankles more,
Than when it bites and healeth not the sore.'

Sir James Lowther, who was Governor Johnstone's second, all readers of Junius must be well acquainted with. His being son-in-law to Lord Bute, was quite sufficient for Junius to take up the Duke of Portland's case, which is fully examined, 12th May 1768. It had previously been discussed in the House of Commons, in the course of the debate on Sir George Saville's Quieting Bill, for which Lord George was a strong advocate.

Sir James formed part of the expedition to St. Malos, with the Duke of Marlborough and Lord George, to the latter of whom he had given offence. I cannot find that Sir James went out in any official capacity, but merely as a looker-on. Some imprudent observation might easily have given this umbrage. After the Nullum Tempus affair in 1768, he was not again noticed by Junius, until this duel had taken place, when the subject, which appeared fully at rest, was again resumed, to expose the litigious spirit of Sir James. The coincidence is not a little singular, although it was matter of no moment to Lord George who was the Governor's second; nevertheless, it appears to have awakened recollections of former enmity.

From this period to the year 1775, the speeches of Lord George were principally on India affairs,

and those of America. He was decidedly against appointing supervisors in India, and he voted against impeaching the Directors of the East India Company, which was agitated in 1772. The debates on India affairs were carried on at this period with much acrimony, invective, and violence ; but on all occasions Lord George appears to have been influenced by no party spirit : he voted conscientiously, gave his opinions with moderation, and preserved a strict regard to the merits of the case. It was on American affairs that he was most calculated to influence the House. His knowledge of that country, through the medium of his intimate friend, Lord Amherst, and others who had served there during the war, was far more extensive than that of India. This is also a characteristic trait in Junius. It was, at length, discovered that his personal assistance was required, to extricate ministers from the labyrinth in which they were entangled. On March 28, 1774, he laid down so clearly the measures which ought to be adopted in the present crisis of affairs, that Lord North publicly thanked him for his hints, observing at the same time, " that they were worthy so great a mind." The substance of the speech alluded to, was principally applicable to the government of Massachusetts's Bay, which might be extended to other parts of the colonies.

" It may not be improper," Lord George ob-

served, " to enlarge a little upon this occasion, and to ask for further information, to know whether this is to be the extent of the proposition with regard to the salutary measures that are to be made and taken in the Committee during this session ; if so, sir, I should be glad to give my opinion, and add my mite of preservation to that country. I could have wished that the noble Lord, when he was framing this scheme of salvation, would have at least considered, that there were other parts of the internal government, necessary to be put under some regulation. I mean particularly the internal government of Massachuset's Bay. I wish to see the council of that country on the same footing as other colonies. There is a degree of absurdity at present in the election of the council. I cannot, sir, disagree with the noble Lord, nor can I think he will do a better thing than to put an end to their town meetings. I would not have men of a mercantile cast consider themselves as ministers of that country. I would not have such men every day collecting themselves together, and debating about political matters. I would have them follow their occupations as merchants, and not consider themselves as ministers. I would also wish that all corporate powers might be given to certain people in every town, in the same manner that

corporations are formed here ; I should then expect to see some subordination, some authority and order. I do not know by what powers those are to be formed, but I would wish them to be formed by some.

“ Again, sir, I think that the method of grand juries ought to be much attended to ; they are now chosen for life, and have a yearly salary ; and these are the men to whom your life and property are entrusted. Your people know to whom to make application, when law and justice are wished to be subverted by favour and affection. Your petty juries are elected annually, so many persons in each town ; to these men offenders know how to apply ; and when any riot happens between the military power and the people of the town, the power of life and death of the offender is lodged in those who are offended. These juries I think require great regulation ; they are totally different from ours, and, in my idea, carry with them not only the highest degree of absurdity, but are subject to be led aside to commit the highest and most palpable enormities against justice and the laws of the land. I would not wish to protract the noble Lord’s bill, by lengthening it out to a degree which he does not wish to go, nor to oppose the measures which he has already adopted. I would wish to bring the Constitution of America as

similar to our own as possible. I would wish to see the council of that country similar to a House of Lords in this. I would wish to see chancery suits determined by a Court of Chancery, and not by the Assembly of that province. At present their Assembly is a downright clog upon all the proceedings of the governor, and the council are continually thwarting and opposing any proposition he may make for the security and welfare of that government. You have, sir, no government—no governor; the whole are the proceedings of a tumultuous and riotous rabble, who ought, if they had the least prudence, to follow their mercantile employments, and not trouble themselves with politics and government, which they do not understand.

“ We are told by some gentlemen, Oh! do not break the charter! do not take away their rights that are granted to them by the predecessors of the Crown! whoever, sir, wishes to preserve such charters, without a due correction and regulation—whoever wishes for such subjects, I wish them no worse than to govern them. Put this people, sir, on a free footing of government; do not let us be every day asserting our rights by words, and they denying our authority, and preventing the execution of our laws. Let us persevere in refining that government which cannot support itself, and proceed in the man-

ner we have begun, and I make no doubt, but by a manly and steady perseverance, things may be restored from a state of anarchy and confusion to peace, quietude, and a due obedience to the laws of this country.”

At this period the contest with America assumed a serious turn. Many of the colonies were in a refractory state, and it required a man of more firmness, decision, and information, than either Lord Hillsborough or Lord Dartmouth possessed, to preside at the helm. It was an unenviable office for any one to enter upon, as affairs in that country had been too loosely managed, and suffered to get too much a-head to admit even a dawn of hope that we should maintain our ground. The colonies had been making vigorous exertions, ever since the riot at Boston, to separate themselves from the mother country and to proclaim their independance. General Washington and other brave leaders determined on accomplishing this object or to perish in the attempt. They were already in possession of some ships, and by land they were considered at that time as the best marksmen and bravest soldiers in the world.

A nation fighting for its independance, at all times assumes a formidable appearance, especially when oppressed by an arbitrary government: so that there remained no obstacles to

obstruct their final success. General Lee's letter from thence (Sept. 28, 1774), depicts the enthusiasm that prevailed amidst a population of 746,000 souls, who were determined to support the cause either with their blood or their money ; and with respect to their generals, it was admitted, they were equal in point of skill and judgment to the English.

Lord George obtained every information of what was passing, through his nephew, Lord Thanet, who corresponded with Lee and other republicans in America, and he could therefore lay before the House a knowledge of American affairs, to which many of the members were utter strangers. Although decidedly hostile to ministers in every thing else, he strenuously continued to support the opinions which he had early imbibed, and which Junius always maintained. Whilst the remainder of the opposition continued to condemn the minister's measures, Lord George supported them. On this account he was considered by Lord North as a suitable auxiliary to labour in the vineyard.

Having expressed this opinion to the King, he concurred in the measure ; and a proposal was made to Lord George, who avowed his determination to support his sentiments. Lord Dartmouth was accordingly removed, and on the 7th Sept. 1775, Lord George Germain took the seals of his office. Soon after his appoint-

ment, Mr. Pownall * was removed from the situation of under secretary, to make room for Richard Cumberland, Esq. the dramatic writer, who, in the Memoirs of his Life, states the circumstance as follows :—

“ A brighter scene now meets me. Whilst I was as yet a subaltern in the Board of Trade, uncomfortably executing the office of clerk to the reports, by the accession of Lord George Germain to the seals for the colonial department, I had a new principal to look up to. I had never been in a room with him in my life, except during his trial at the Horse-guards for the affair of Minden, which I attended through the whole of its progress, and regularly reported what occurred to Mr. Dodington, who was then out of town. Some of his letters I preserved, but of my own, according to custom, I took no copies. When Lord George had taken the seals, I asked my friend, Colonel James Cunninghame, to take me with him to Pall Mall, which he did, and the ceremony of paying my respects was soon dismissed. I confess, I thought my new chief was quite as cold in his manner, as a minister need be, and rather more so than my intermediate friend had given me reason to expect. I was now living in great intimacy with the Duke of Dorset, and asked him to do me that grace with

* See Junius, Vol. III. p. 138.

his uncle, which the honour of being acknowledged by him as his friend would naturally have obtained for me. This, I am confident, he would readily have done, but for reasons which precluded all desire on my part to say another word on the business. I was therefore left to make my own way with a perfect stranger, whilst I was in actual negotiation with Mr. Pownall for the secretaryship, and had understood Lord Clare to be friendly to our treaty, in the very moment when he ceased to be our first Lord, and the power of accommodating us was shifted from his hands into those of Lord George. I considered it therefore as an opportunity gone by, and entertained no further hopes of succeeding. A very short time had sufficed to confirm the idea I had entertained of Lord George's character for decision and dispatch in business. There was at once an end to all our circumlocutory reports and inefficient forms, that had only impeded business, and substituted ambiguity for precision; there, was, as William Gerard Hamilton, speaking of Lord George, truly observed to me, no trash in his mind; he studied no choice phrases, no superfluous words, nor ever suffered the clearness of his conceptions to be clouded by the obscurity of his expressions, for these were the simplest and most unequivocal that could be made use of for explaining his

opinions, or dictating his instructions. In the mean while, he was so momentarily punctual to his time, so religiously observant of his engagements, that we, who served under him in office, felt the sweets of the exchange we had so lately made in the person of our chief.

“ I had now no other prospect but that of serving in my subordinate situation under an easy master with security and comfort, for as I was not flattered with the share of any notices from him, but such as I might reasonably expect, I built no hopes upon his favour, nor allowed myself to think I was in any train of succeeding in my treaty with our secretary for his office ; and as I had reason to believe he was equally happy with myself in serving under such a principal, I took for granted he would move no further in the business. One day, as Lord George was leaving the office, he stopt me on the outside of the door, at the head of the stairs, and invited me to pass some days with him and his family at Stoneland near Tunbridge Wells. It was on my part so unexpected, that I doubted if I had rightly understood him, as he had spoken in a low and submitted voice, as his manner was, and I consulted his confidential secretary, Mr. D’Oyley *, whether he would advise me to the journey. He told me,

* See Junius, Vol. III. p. 445.

that he knew the house was filled from top to bottom with a large party, that he was sure there would be no room for me, and dissuaded me from the undertaking. I did not quite follow his advice by neglecting to present myself, but I resolved to secure my retreat to Tunbridge Wells, and kept my chaise in waiting to make good my quarters. When I arrived at Stone-land, I was met at the door by Lord George, who soon discovered the precaution I had taken, and himself conducting me to my bed-chamber, told me it had been reserved for me, and ever after would be set apart as mine, where he hoped I would consent to find myself at home. This was the man I had esteemed so cold ; and thus was I at once introduced to the commencement of a friendship, which day by day improved, and which no one word or action of his life to come, ever for an instant interrupted or diminished.

“ Shortly after this it came to his knowledge that there had been a treaty between Mr. Pownall and me, for his resignation of the place of Secretary, and he asked me what had passed. I told him how it stood, and what the conditions were that my superior in office expected for the accommodation. I had not mentioned this to him, and probably, never should. He said he would take it into his own hands, and in a few days signified the King’s pleasure that Mr.

Pownall's resignation was accepted, and that I should succeed him as Secretary, in clear and full enjoyment of the place, without any compensation whatsoever. Thus was I, beyond all hope, and without a word said to me, that could lead me to expect a favour of that sort, promoted by surprise to a very advantageous and desirable situation. I came to my office at the hour appointed, not dreaming of such an event, and took my seat at the adjoining table, when, Mr. Pownall being called out of the room, Lord George turned round to me and bade me take his chair at the bottom of the table, announcing to the Board, his Majesty's commands, as above recited, with a positive prohibition of all stipulations.

“When I had endeavoured to express myself as properly on the occasion as my agitated state of spirits would allow of, I remember Lord George made answer, “That if I was as well pleased upon receiving his Majesty's commands, as he was in being the bearer of them, I was indeed very happy.” If I served him truly, honestly, and ardently, ever after this, till I followed him to the grave, where is my merit? How could I do otherwise? I experienced no abatement in the friendship of Lord George Germain: on the contrary, it was from this time, chiefly, to the day of his death, that I lived in

the greatest intimacy with him. Whilst he held the seals, I continued to attend upon him both in public and private, rendering him all the voluntary service in my power, particularly on his levee-days which he held in my apartment in the Plantation Office, though he had ceased to preside at the Board of Trade: and here a great number of American loyalists, who had taken refuge in England, were in the habit of resorting to him; it was an arduous and delicate business to conduct; I may add, it was also a business of some personal risque and danger, as it engaged me in very serious explanations, upon more occasions than one. Upon Lord George putting into my hands a letter he had received from a certain naval officer, very disrespectful towards him, and most unjustifiably so to me, for having brought him an answer to an application, which he was pleased to consider as private and confidential, I felt myself obliged to take the letter with me to that gentleman, and require him to write and sign an apology of my own dictating; whatever was his motive for doing what I peremptorily required, so it was, that to my very great surprise he submitted to transcribe and sign it; and when I exhibited it to Lord George, he acknowledged it to be the most complete revocation he had ever met with. *There were other situations still more delicate, in which I oc-*

asionally became involved, but which I forbear to mention ; but in these unpleasant times, men's passions were inflamed ; and in every case, when reasoning would not serve to allay intemperance, and explanation was lost upon them, I never scrupled to abide the consequences."

Mr. Cumberland did ample justice to his patron, in remuneration for the kindness he received at his hands. He appears to have served him confidentially and faithfully ; and became, in consequence, intrusted with secrets of a critical nature. He has done wisely in withholding circumstances which he was bound in honour not to disclose. It was indeed an era of great anxiety : the war, which Lord George flattered himself would have terminated favourably, assumed an alarming appearance. The Americans, at the outset, got the advantage at Bunker's Hill, drove the English from the heights, and would, in all probability, have gained the day, had they continued to have maintained their post ; but the stratagem of the English general, similar to that of William the Conqueror at the battle of Hastings, ultimately succeeded in drawing them from their strong hold, which ended in their defeat. They, nevertheless, continued successful in various other parts, and by degrees gained such an accession of strength, that nothing could withstand their attacks. Hundreds flocked to

the Independant Standard, they gathered like a tempest, and, like the fury of a whirlwind, scattered their enemies in all directions. In this state of things, it would have been wise on the part of our Government to have made peace on the best terms they could, without continuing to lavish a waste of men and money to no purpose whatever; but Lord North and Lord George continued inexorable, firm in their determination to support the King's private opinions, which were to prosecute the war to the last extremity. Accounts were daily arriving of further losses; but when the defeat of Lord Cornwallis was publicly announced in this country, it was evident the conflict was nearly decided. The arrival of this intelligence is too interesting to pass over, as it not only shews the firmness of the King on this occasion, but the coolness of Lord George, on whom the responsibility rested. Every one perceived it was the sign manual for abandoning those pretensions which we could no longer hold. Sir N. Wraxall dined the same day at Lord George's table, and has given us the particulars in the following words. "During the whole month of November 1781, the concurrent accounts transmitted to Government, enumerating Lord Cornwallis's embarrassments, and the positions taken by the enemy, augmented the anxiety of the cabinet. Lord George

Germain, in particular, conscious that in the prosperous or adverse termination of that expedition, must hinge the fate of the American contest, his own stay in office, as well as, probably, the duration of the ministry itself, felt, and even expressed to his friends, the strongest uneasiness on the subject. The meeting of parliament, meanwhile, stood for the 27th November. On Sunday the 25th, about noon, official intelligence of the surrender of the British forces at York Town, arrived from Falmouth, at Lord George Germain's house in Pall-Mall. Lord Walsingham, who previous to his father, Sir William de Grey's elevation to the peerage, had been Under Secretary of State in that department, and who was selected to second the address in the House of Peers, on the subsequent Tuesday, happened to be there when the messenger brought the news. Without communicating it to any other person, Lord George, for the purpose of dispatch, immediately got with him into a hackney-coach, and drove to Lord Stormant's residence in Portland-place. Having imparted to him the disastrous intelligence, and taken him into the carriage, they instantly proceeded to the Chancellor's house in Great Russel-street, Bloomsbury, whom they found at home; when, after a short consultation, they determined to lay it themselves, in person, before Lord North. He had

not received any intimation of the event when they arrived at his door in Downing-street, between one and two o'clock. The first minister's firmness, and even his presence of mind, gave way, for a short time, under this awful disaster. I asked Lord George afterwards, how he took the communication when made to him? 'as he would have taken a ball in his breast,' replied Lord George. For he opened his arms, exclaiming wildly, as he paced up and down the apartment during a few minutes, 'Oh, God! it is all over!' words which he repeated many times, under emotions of the deepest agitation and distress. When the first agitation of his mind had subsided, the four ministers discussed the question, whether or not it might be expedient to prorogue parliament for a few days; but as scarcely an interval of forty-eight hours remained before the appointed time of assembling, and as many members of both houses were already either arrived in London, or on the road, that proposition was abandoned. It became, however, indispensable to alter, and almost to model anew, the King's speech, which had been already drawn up and completely prepared for delivering from the throne. This alteration was therefore made without delay; and at the same time, Lord George Germain, as Secretary for the American Department, sent off a dispatch

to his Majesty, who was then at Kew, acquainting him with the melancholy termination of Lord Cornwallis's expedition. Some hours having elapsed before these different, but necessary acts of business, could take place, the members separated, and Lord George Germain repaired to his office in Whitehall. There he found a confirmation of the intelligence, which arrived about two hours after the first communication, having been transmitted from Dover, to which place it was forwarded from Calais, with the French account of the same event.

“ I dined that day at Lord George's; and though the information which had reached London in the course of the morning, from two different quarters, was of a nature not to admit of long concealment, yet it had not been communicated either to me, or to any individual of the company, as it might naturally have been through the channel of common report, when I got to Pall-Mall, between five and six o'clock. Lord Walsingham, who likewise dined there, was the only person present, except Lord George, acquainted with the fact. The party, nine in number, sat down to table. I thought the master of the house appeared serious, though he manifested no discomposure. Before the dinner was finished, one of the servants delivered him a letter, brought back by the messenger who had

been dispatched to the King. Lord George opened and perused it: then looking at Lord Walsingham, to whom he exclusively directed his observation, 'The King writes,' said he, 'just as he always does, except that I observe he has omitted to mark the hour and minute of his writing, with his usual precision.' This remark, though calculated to awaken some interest, excited no comment; and while the ladies, Lord George's three daughters, remained in the room, we repressed our curiosity. But they had no sooner withdrawn, than Lord George having acquainted us, that from Paris, information had just arrived of the old Count de Maurepas, first minister, lying at the point of death. 'It would grieve me,' said I, 'to finish my career, however far advanced in years, were I first minister of France, before I had witnessed the termination of this great contest between England and America.' 'He has survived to see that event,' replied Lord George, with some agitation. Utterly unsuspecting of the fact which had happened beyond the Atlantic, I conceived him to allude to the indecisive naval action, fought at the mouth of the Chesapeake, early in the preceding month of September, between Admiral Graves and Count de Grasse; which, in its results, might prove most injurious to Lord Cornwallis. Under this impression, 'My meaning,'

said I 'is, that if I were the Count de Maurepas I should wish to live long enough to behold the final issue of the war in Virginia.' 'He has survived to witness it completely,' answered Lord George; 'the army has surrendered, and you may peruse the particulars of the capitulation in that paper'; taking, at the same time, one from his pocket, which he delivered into my hand, not without visible emotion. By his permission I read it aloud, while the company listened in profound silence. We then discussed its contents, as affecting the country, the ministry, and the war. It must be confessed they were calculated to diffuse a gloom over the most convivial society, and that they opened a wide field for political speculation. After perusing the contents of Lord Cornwallis's surrender at York Town, it was impossible for all present not to feel a lively curiosity to know how the King had received the intelligence, as well as how he had expressed himself in his note to Lord George Germain, on the first communication of so painful an event. He gratified our wish by reading it to us, observing at the same time, that it did the highest honour to his Majesty's fortitude, firmness, and consistency of character. The words made an impression on my memory, which the lapse of more than thirty years has not erased; and I shall here commemorate its

tenor, as serving to shew how that Prince felt and wrote, under one of the most afflicting, as well as humiliating occurrences of his reign. The billet ran nearly to this effect: 'I have received with sentiments of the deepest concern, the communication which Lord George Germain has made to me, of the unfortunate result of the operations in Virginia. I particularly lament it, on account of the consequences connected with it, and the difficulties which it may produce in carrying on the public business, or in repairing such a misfortune. But I trust that neither Lord George Germain, nor any member of the cabinet will suppose, that it makes the smallest alteration in those principles of my conduct, which have directed me in past time, and which will always continue to animate me under every event, in the prosecution of the present contest.' Not a sentiment of despondency or of despair was to be found in the letter; the very hand-writing of which indicated composure of mind. Whatever opinion we may entertain relative to the practicability of reducing America to obedience by force of arms at the end of 1781, we must admit, that no Sovereign could manifest more calmness, dignity or self-command, than George the Third displayed in his reply."

Had Mr. Grenville's measures been steadily

pursued and adopted, or, had the hint been taken which Junius threw out in 1767 soon after the riot at Boston, in all probability the colonies would be in our possession to this day. To the Earl of Chatham's measures, history may attribute the record of the event just alluded to. Junius foresaw the consequence, and pointed out, in language hardly to be exceeded in energy, the fatal delusion under which that administration laboured. "These were the wretched ministers," said he, "who served at the altar, while the high priest with more than frantic fury, offered up his bleeding country a victim to America." That prediction was afterwards fully verified. Had the colonies been properly supported at that time, and with the same vigour which was manifested towards our possessions in the East Indies, the Americans would have been kept under subjection, and, as Lord George so emphatically said in the House, "they must ultimately have returned to their allegiance." There was less probability of our losing America, than our East India settlements. When either became refractory, the remedy was in our power. But if once neglected, when a nation becomes unsettled, and gradually keeps gaining ground for seven years, it is out of all human power ever to restore peace and tranquillity. We have witnessed it in

France : we have witnessed it in Spain : in the civil wars in our own country ; and, finally, we have witnessed it in the loss of America : a nation now become so powerful, that if ever this country be conquered, it will be from that quarter. Those very men who were the cause of all the calamity, and who were obliged to be removed from office because they could no longer maintain their credit and reputation, had the baseness afterwards to lay the blame upon Lord George, and to make it one of their objections that he should not be raised to the Peerage, because his measures were inadequate to extricate the country from those difficulties, in which they themselves had been the primary cause of involving it. The Earl of Chatham might in some points have been a very wise man, but in American affairs he proved himself a very weak one.

The principles of Lord George never wavered : however great the dilemma appeared, he maintained a strict consistency, and rather than submit to a treaty dishonourable to his country, he was determined to persevere in pursuing the war : but the voice of the whole country being against a farther sacrifice, he tendered his resignation, maintaining to the last moment in office, those principles which he had pledged his

word to the King and to Lord North should remain unchangeable.

Early in the month of February 1782, Lord George Germain having resigned the seat of his office into the King's hands, received, in recompense of his services, the honor of the Peerage. "The circumstances attending that elevation," continues Sir N. Wraxall, "which became immediately afterwards a subject of discussion in the House of Lords, I received on the same day when they took place from Lord George's own mouth; and they are too curious, as well as characteristic, to be omitted in these memoirs. The separation between the sovereign and the secretary, was by no means unaccompanied with emotion on both sides; which became probably augmented by the dark cloud overhanging the throne, together with the circumstances that produced the necessity for Lord George's resignation. The King who could not shut his eyes to these facts, doubtless foresaw the possibility, if not probability, of greater changes in the administration, as imminent; of which the removal of the American Secretary, was only the forerunner and the presage. After regretting the unfortunate events that had dictated the measure, and thanking Lord George for his services, his Majesty added, 'Is there any thing

I can do, to express my sense of them, which would be agreeable to you?' 'Sir,' answered he, 'if your Majesty is pleased to raise me to the dignity of the Peerage, it will form at once the best reward to which I can aspire, and the best proof of your approbation of my past exertions in your affairs.' 'By all means,' said the King, 'I think it very proper and shall do it with pleasure.' 'Then, sir,' rejoined Lord George, 'if you agree to my first request, I hope you will not think it unbecoming, or unreasonable in me, to ask another favor. It is to create me a *Viscount*, as, should I be only raised to the dignity of a *Baron*, my own secretary, my lawyer, and my father's page, will all take rank of me.' The King expressing a wish to know the names of the persons to whom he alluded, 'the first,' replied Lord George, 'is Lord Walsingham, who, as your Majesty knows, was long under Secretary of State in my office, when Mr. de Grey. The second is Lord Loughborough, who has been always my legal adviser. Lord Amherst is the third, who when page to my father, the late Duke of Dorset, has often sat on the braces of the state-coach that conveyed him, as Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, to the Parliament House at Dublin.' The King smiled, adding, 'What you say, is very reasonable; it shall be so; and now let me know the title that you choose.' 'I have already, sir,' answered Lord

George, 'in the possible anticipation of your Majesty's gracious disposition towards me, spoken to the Duke of Dorset, and obtained his permission, as the head of my family, to take the title of *Sackville*; having been compelled to renounce my own name, in order to avail myself of the bequest of the estate of Drayton in Northamptonshire, made me by Lady Betty Germain in her will, I shall therefore, in some degree, recover it by this means.' 'I quite approve of that idea,' replied his Majesty, 'and if you will state to me your title, I will write it down myself before we part and send it directly to the Chancellor.'

"The King immediately placed himself at a table, took the pen and ink lying upon it, and having committed the *Viscounty* to paper, asked him what *Barony* he chose? Lord George answered, 'that of Bolebrook in Sussex, being one of the most antient estates belonging to the family, and contiguous to Buckhurst, the original Peerage conferred by Queen Elizabeth on his ancestor, the first Earl of Dorset.' When the King had copied it, he rose up, and with the most condescending expressions of concern, as well as satisfaction, allowed Lord George to withdraw from the closet. As this is one of the few Peerages, which in the course of half a century, George the Third has been allowed to confer, wholly independent of ministerial inter-

vention or recommendation, from the impulse of his own inclinations, its origin and creation attain an additional interest."

As soon as it was publicly known that the King had conferred this honour upon Lord George for his services, the Marquis of Carmarthen brought forward a motion in the House of Lords, to prevent the new-created Peer from taking his seat among them: the Marquis disclaimed any personal animosity, but he considered it derogatory to the honor of that House to admit a person still labouring under the heavy censure of a Court-Martial. The language of the Earl of Shelburne, the Earl of Abingdon, and the Duke of Richmond on this occasion, was beneath their dignity as Peers of the realm. They heaped upon Lord George unmerited insults, which at any time would be unfit for the debates of such an assembly. Even provided they had any cause of enmity against him, as Junius, of which character they strongly suspected him, that was not a suitable place, nor a suitable occasion for such resentment. The whole proceeding was pronounced by Lord Thurlow, extra-judicial and irregular. Lord Sackville's reply was so powerful, so animated, and so much to the point, that they had cause to blush at their unmanly behaviour, and it was universally admitted, even by his enemies, that

a more dignified speech was never made within those walls. The Marquis's motion was lost a second time. I lay the particulars before the reader, as intimately connected with the life of this persecuted nobleman, that every unprejudiced mind may witness the motives which influenced the speakers on this memorable occasion.

House of Lords, Feb. 7, 1782.*—The Marquis of Carmarthen rose and said, that he understood, a person who had in his military character been publicly degraded, was shortly to be called up to that House. He did not mean to dispute the prerogative of the crown; but he thought the creating such a person a Peer, was a disgrace to the House. He felt so in his own breast, and he trusted every one of their lordships would be impressed with feelings of a similar nature. He called, therefore, upon the House for assistance and instruction: he knew not what sort of motion to frame, nor what step it would be regular to take, previous to the disgrace falling upon the Peerage, to mark their sense of the circumstance: and in doing this, he solemnly protested he was actuated by no motive of a political or personal nature; he sincerely pitied the individual who laboured under

* From Cobbett's Parliamentary Debates.

such a heavy load of stigma, as in his mind was contained in the sentence in question : a copy of which he held in his hand. It was on that account, and that only, that he thought it a dishonour to the Peerage to have such a person made a member of it. If the sentence had been altered after a revision of the facts that came out upon the trial, and done away, as much too severe ; in short, if the marked disgrace it affixed on the person made the subject of it, was removed in any way whatever, he should think all objections removed instantly ; but while the sentence remained in full force, he could not but conceive it to be an ample reason for their lordships coming to some resolution, expressive of their opinion upon it. This feeling struck his mind as soon as he heard the report, and he had communicated it only to one man living, though he had, that morning, conversed with noble lords then in the house on other topics : so conscious was he, that the bare mention of it would be sufficient to induce every one of their lordships to feel, as men jealous of their honor must necessarily feel upon such an occasion.

Finding no Peer rose immediately, his Lordship got up again and moved, "That it is derogatory to the honour of this House, that any person labouring under the heavy censure comprehend-

ed in the following sentence of a Court-Martial, and the public order given out in consequence thereof, should be recommended to the crown to be raised to the dignity of the Peerage, viz : ‘ This Court, upon due consideration of the whole matter before them, is of opinion, that Lord George Sackville is guilty of having disobeyed the orders of Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick, whom he was, by his commission and instructions, directed to obey as commander-in-chief, according to the rules of war ; and it is the farther opinion of this Court, that the said Lord George Sackville is, and he is hereby adjudged unfit to serve his Majesty in any military capacity whatever.’ Which sentence his Majesty was pleased to confirm, viz : ‘ It is his Majesty’s pleasure that the above sentence be given out in public orders, that officers, being convinced, that neither high birth, nor great employments, can shelter offences of such a nature ; and that seeing they are subject to censures much worse than death to a man who has any sense of honor, they may avoid the fatal consequences arising from disobedience of orders.’ ”

The Lord Chancellor [Thurlow], left the Woolsack and informed the House, that he felt it to be his duty to state to their lordships, that it would be in his mind, altogether irregular and

disorderly, even to put such a motion as he held in his hand. The motion turned altogether upon a fact, by no means before the House, and surely it would be extremely hard, and very inconsistent with their lordships' usual liberality and candour, to annex so severe a censure as the censure of that House to a sentence supposed to have been passed on a certain person therein named, at a particular given time, but to all which facts (*viz.* the demerits of the party, which called upon him such a sentence, to the sitting of the court-martial, to their having declared such a judgment, and to the other matters stated in the supposed circular order), the House was at that moment, in point of Parliamentary form, utter strangers. Having stated this, his Lordship submitted it to the noble Lord, whether it was such a motion, as he, on cooler consideration, would wish to have inserted in the Journals?

Lord Denbigh objected to the motion as very extraordinary and altogether unprecedented. His Lordship stated, that the court-martial was held, when a particular complexion of politics prevailed in the cabinet; that only four years afterwards, when a different administration came in, the noble Lord aimed at in the present motion, was, at the desire of that administration, restored to a seat in the Privy Council, an evident proof that the ministry

of that day (the chief of whom were now in opposition), *thought the noble Lord's advice of great importance to the State.* He had since been distinguished as a minister worthy of his Sovereign's confidence. The Crown indisputably had a right to bestow the honours of the Peerage, as it thought proper, and conceiving the motion to be altogether unnecessary, he should conclude with moving to adjourn.

The Earl of Abingdon * said, the person who was the subject of the motion, had been the greatest criminal this country ever knew. He had been the author of all the calamities of the war, and all the distresses which Great Britain now groaned under. It was to his blood-thirstiness, his weakness, his wickedness, and his mismanagement, that the war had been prosecuted at so large a waste of blood and treasure, and with such a miserable repetition of ill-successes. He therefore ought not to be suffered to come into that House, and contaminate the Peerage.

The Duke of Richmond said, certainly the noble Lord [Denbigh], had a right to move the question of adjournment upon the motion ; but if the ministry suffered a matter of so much importance to be got rid of in that manner, they would act more contemptibly than even he could have thought them capable of. He was

* Afterwards imprisoned in the King's Bench for a libel.

astonished at their silence on a motion of that kind, and still more at their acquiescing in the motion of adjournment. Was he the person in question made the subject of the motion, he should think himself extremely ill-used, and complain loudly of such treatment. For God's sake, have not ministers a single word to say in defence of their colleague? Were they so much at variance with each other, that when a matter of this kind came on, they neither dared treat the motion with defiance, nor attempt to palliate the imputed guilt of their brother minister? Would it not be wiser to debate the motion, than pitifully to move an adjournment? He was most heartily ashamed of the conduct of ministers that day.

Viscount Stormont said, he knew not that the noble Lord in question stood in need of any defence. With regard to the present motion, it clearly trenched upon the prerogative of the Crown; it trenched upon a right inherent in the Sovereign, which even the noble Marquis who made the motion, had felt himself obliged to confess was indisputable. He knew of no disqualification for the Peerage short of legal disability; and therefore when any other was attempted to be urged within those walls, he should consider it as an unconstitutional attack on the prerogative, and should always be of opi-

nion that a motion for adjournment was the proper way of getting rid of it.

The Marquis of Carmarthen said, he had drawn up the motion hastily, and therefore it might be possibly liable to the charge of incorrectness. He begged that their Lordships would recollect that he had desired their assistance. With regard to the argument of the noble Lord in the green ribbon, that nothing short of legal disability ought to excite the alarm of the House, perhaps the noble Lord was not aware how far that argument went. It was rather ludicrous to adduce such an instance, but, according to the same mode of reasoning, the King's chimney sweeper might be made a Peer, and undoubtedly the right to create a Peer was inherent in the prerogative of the Crown—ought such a creation to take place? Undoubtedly the noble Earl had a right to move the question of adjournment; but this he would assure their Lordships, ministers should not get rid of this motion that way, for he was determined to make it day by day, until something satisfactory was done in it.

The Earl of Abingdon declared, since legal disability was all that would do to prevent the House from being tainted with such a member, if he were sent up there, he would do his business; as he had *in his own house, ample*

materials to make the ground-work of an impeachment; and which he would certainly produce, if the person in question attempted to come among them. He further declared, he hoped there were those in the House, who were ready to run to their Master, and give him an account of what had passed that day upon the subject. If they gave him a true account, the effect would be, a rescue of the House from the contamination they were threatened with.

The Earl of Derby lamented that the noble Marquis should be so ill supported on a point of such serious importance. He declared he thought it a great and a serious insult to their Lordships to see a person created a Peer, whose disgrace was entered in the orderly books of every British regiment.

The Duke of Grafton spoke in support of the motion.

The Earl of Shelburne said, it gave him extreme pain to take any part in the present debate, and the more so, because very early in life, before he was of age to be a member of either house of Parliament, and before he knew enough of the world to discover of how little importance it was, that so insignificant an individual as he was, made one of the number of society, *he had suffered many professional injuries from the person who was the subject of debate.*

Smarting with a sense of those injuries at the time, a sort of enmity had taken place between him and the person in question : from the moment, however, that he saw the sentence of the court-martial, and the orders which had been read to the House, and which now made a part of the motion, he called upon God Almighty to witness, that he had neither privately nor publicly, directly nor indirectly, in thought, word, or deed, done that person the smallest injury, or bore hard upon him on any occasion whatever. Indeed, his moderation in that respect had been more than once noticed by his friends, and he had experienced opportunities of explaining to those, who put the matter to him, the reasons of his conduct. He hoped, therefore, that what he should now say, would not be imputed to the latent seeds of an old hatred twenty years' standing : solemnly protesting, every spark of that animosity was extinguished. He said, however unpopular the opinion might be, he had not the smallest objection to the King's being his own minister. He did not know, but the King's having an opinion of his own, and feeling his interest in the management of the affairs of the realm, might be better for the general weal than his remaining a type of a mere King of Mahrattas. For fear their Lordships might not know what a King of Mahrattas was, from not

Having lately read so much of the history of India, its government, and its customs, as he had done, he would inform their Lordships, that a King of the Mahrattas was a mere nominal monarch * ; he had his pechaw, a cabinet who were efficient, and who, to all intents and purposes, held and directed the reins of government, while they kept the King locked up, and in pretty nearly a state of idiotism. He declared in every moment of his life, he had ever endeavoured to treat his Majesty with that profound respect due to his person, and with that reverence so infinitely due to his estimation. His loyalty had remained the firmest principle in his bosom, and in all situations, and on all occasions, he had studiously kept the duty of a faithful and respectful subject in view. He might therefore, he hoped, be permitted, without charge of the smallest indecency, to say that, when the prerogative was exercised to its fullest extent, he wished to God to see the Parliament free. A high toned prerogative Prince and a servile corrupt Parliament, was the strongest symptom of despotism and anarchy. He could not therefore but anxiously wish to see a perfect representation of the people, and when that happy period arrived, he

* This alludes to Junius's declaration, of the subjection in which the King's ministers kept him.

should be grounded in entertaining a reasonable expectation of better prosperity. It had been imagined that the House of Peers had it not in their power to right itself against the extraordinary stretches of prerogative. The supposition was founded in error. An author, whose works he had read some years since, the chief of which was a book upon the Peerage, written by Lord Chancellor West, pretty clearly evinced to his mind, that there were latent powers belonging to the House of Lords, which, if called forth, by sufficient occasion, and duly and spiritedly exercised, were equal to the correcting of any abuses of the prerogative that might be attempted.

A noble Earl has termed the present motion a very extraordinary motion. Good God! were not these very extraordinary times? Who could have owned himself so gloomy in his ideas some years ago, as to have acknowledged, that he ever imagined it possible, that a day would have arrived, when that House should have resolved to institute an enquiry into the cause of the surrender of the second army into the hands of the Americans, and that it should have been a matter of doubt and debate in that House, whether they ought or ought not to admit a motion to pass in its original form, because some of the words seemed to carry in them a recognition of the independence of America? No man, the

wisest that ever existed, would have pretended to have foreseen a possibility of two such events happening in the course of oneday! His Lordship took notice of its having been said, that Lord George Germain was restored to the Privy Council by the Rockingham administration. He declared he had not been a member of that administration, though he was free to say, it was composed of able and honest men. *When he agreed to take a situation soon afterwards, he excepted to the measure alluded to**. A noble Earl, now no more, with whom he had been in the habits of living on terms of great familiarity, had objected to the measure likewise; and he perfectly recollected, that when it was pressed upon the noble Earl to pursue the person, now alluded to, in the House of Commons, and to make his expulsion a consequence of his disgrace, the noble Earl, with that wisdom and sagacity that ever marked his conduct, refused to do so, and that for the wisest reasons. He remembered, that the noble Earl, on being desired by a person of great authority to enforce the weight of government against the noble Lord, refused to do so for very good reasons; he was answered in these words, "Well, sir, I wish you

* This circumstance fully accounts for Junius styling Lord Shelburne, a Malagrida. Vol. II. p. 473.

much joy of the company you choose to keep." The reason why the Earl refused to aim the vengeance of government against the party in question, was no other than the consideration that the noble Lord represented a family borough, and their Lordships knew what family boroughs were. Had the party been expelled the House, the Earl wisely argued, how was he to know that he might not be chosen and re-chosen again and again, in spite of repeated expulsions? His Lordship said, there was an essential difference between the person in question being allowed to sit in the other House and being suffered to come up there. There was a great distinction surely between the one House and the other, however the other House might entertain different opinions. In its real constitutional point of view, no man thought more highly of the House of Commons than he did; it was then a truly respectable, a truly useful branch of the legislature; but when sunk into corruption, when it became the mere creature of the minister, and affected to be a kind of septennial nobility, without the real dignity, and a lesser aristocracy, without the means, the situation and the real personal interest in the state, it became an object of public contempt, and an instrument of public danger. With regard to the person now designed to be created a peer, he called upon

the learned adviser of the Crown, and asked why? When it was first thought of to make that person a Secretary of State, those who had held such strong language of "*Kill them, or they will kill you,*" and who had declared "*We had passed the Rubicon*" before any other person knew we were seriously at war with America, had not acted in conformity with their high sounding tone, and made their actions accompany their words? Why they had not behaved like men of integrity, gone to the Sovereign and advised him honestly and wisely to employ those men only as instruments in the planning, direction, conduct, and execution of an attempt of such infinite importance as the recovery of America, who were the most unexceptionable in every respect, both here and in America, and the most likely to prove successful instruments in the greatest work this nation ever took in hand? In appointing the noble Lord to the secretary of stateship and entrusting him with the management of the war, they in a manner began the war with the greatest insult to America that could possibly have been devised.

The House then divided, when there appeared

For the motion, 28,

Against it, 75.

Notwithstanding this decision, the Marquis of Carmarthen again brought the subject forward on the 18th inst.

He began by saying, that no gentleman could be more anxious to preserve the prerogative of the crown than himself: yet he must entreat their Lordships to consider, that the honour and purity of the House were all that served to convey to the world in general, that idea of weight, importance, and dignity, which they had hitherto held, and which he humbly hoped, their Lordships would ever continue to preserve in the eyes of all mankind. From the noble Lord who was the object of the motion, he was ready to acknowledge he had received civilities while he was himself about the court, in a particular situation, although he had never lived with him on terms of very great intimacy. He should now proceed to state a motion, tending to censure those of his Majesty's ministers, who had so far forgot their necessary respect for the dignity of that House, and all consideration of what was due to the military and to the public opinion, as to advise his Majesty to confer a Peerage and a seat in that House, on a person labouring under so severe a stigma as that contained in the sentence of the Court-Martial and the orders issued thereupon, which now stood in full force

against the unfortunate nobleman in question. His Lordship said he took the matter up entirely upon the sentence of the Court-Martial, the notoriety of which, and of the orders that were at this moment inserted in every orderly-book of every regiment of the army in Great Britain, warranted him in proceeding to consider both the one and the other as authentic. Had we no farther use for the military, that so shameful an instance of relaxation of all military discipline and the abandonment of all example was to be put in practice in the face of the whole world? Was not the very opposite the fact? Surrounded on all sides by enemies, dangerously powerful and numerous as they were, did their Lordships in their consciences think it politic or expedient, just at this moment, to set so alarming a precedent of the relaxation of all military discipline to the whole army? Did they imagine our officers would serve better for the remainder of the war, from such a measure? He could not for his part help expressing his astonishment at the noble Lord's own conduct in accepting the honour of a Peerage, considering the particular circumstances that he stood in at the moment of his being called up to that dignity. His Lordship said he would trouble the House no farther just then, but would proceed to make his motion:

“ That it was highly reprehensible in any person to advise the crown to exercise its indisputable right of creating a Peer, in favour of a person labouring under the heavy censure of the sentence of a Court-Martial and public orders given out in consequence thereof.”

The Earl of Abingdon.—“ My Lords, the noble Lord in my eye [Shelburne] who is so fully informed on every subject, and who never speaks without giving new lights to your Lordships, having led me to consider the subject of the original rights of this House, I rise just to state to your Lordships what my sense of the matter is. I cannot help conceiving, that although there is not a right of election, there is and must be a right of exclusion vested in this House, when the admission of any Peer happens to be against the sense of your Lordships; and my judgment of this arises, not only from the idea that this House is possessed of original rights, as independent of the crown, but as of the people. It is true that the crown is the fountain of honour, and that the creation of Peers is the sole prerogative of the crown, because it is not in the Lords or Commons to do; as therefore no Peer can be introduced into this House without the will of the crown, so, of course, the creation of Peers may be said to be the sole prerogative of the crown: but at the

same time, as every prerogative is given for the benefit of those over whom it is to be exercised, so when the exercise of it is against the sense of those for whose benefit it is intended, its operation by the very reason of the thing must cease and determine. Your Lordships perceive that this is matter of speculation only, and I wish it had continued so : but we are now taught, that speculation and practice are not always the cause and effect of each other. Against every thing that has been said, against common sense, against common decency ; in the face of all public virtue, and in encouragement of every private vice, we find a man foisted in upon us, and with the reward of nobility made one of ourselves. How, my Lords, the majority of the House will feel this, I know not. I fear, my Lords, *as they have long since felt every thing else*, that they are ready to sell their birthright for a mess of porridge. For myself, only, I can speak, and for myself I do assure your Lordships, that I consider this admission of Lord George Germain to the Peerage, to be no less than an insufferable indignity to this House, than an outrageous insult to the people at large. It is an indignity to this House, because it is connecting us with one, whom every soldier as a man of honour is forbid to associate with. It is an insult to the people at large, for, what has he

done to merit honours superior to his fellow-citizens? I will tell your Lordships what he has done: he has undone his country; and inso-much has executed the plan of that accursed, invisible, though efficient cabinet, from whom, as he has received his orders, so has he obtained his reward. For these reasons, I shall heartily support the motion. There is one thing I will just suggest to your Lordships' consideration, without any comment. This matter having been debated by your Lordships before, was it proper in a noble Peer of this House, the Keeper of the Great Seal, to affix that seal to the patent, before the sense of your Lordships was known?"

Viscount Sackville rose next, and began with apologising for his venturing to trouble their Lordships, after having been only a few days a member of that House, but as the subject under discussion so very particularly concerned himself, he trusted their Lordships would not consider it an act of impropriety in him to wish to be heard early in the debate, and would favour him so far as to listen to the opinion he was about to deliver on the motion, and the grounds on which it had been opened to the House, with patience and with candour. With regard to the honour which his Majesty had been pleased to confer on him, as a mark of his royal grace, and in

approbation of his services, he knew not by whose advice it was that he had been so favoured, neither did he know that the advice of any minister whatever was necessary. To bestow honours was the peculiar, the indisputable, the admitted prerogative of the crown, when the person on whom those honours were bestowed was competent to receive them. He held himself to be in every way competent to receive the honours he had been so fortunate as to experience at the hands of his royal master, and he was ready to rest the whole of the question on his being able to prove in any manner, in any place, and on any occasion whatever, that he was the person so competent. The motion stated the sentence of the court-martial, as the ground of objection to his being made a peer : he was ready to meet the argument on that point, and to contend that the sentence amounted to no disqualification whatever. The court-martial which pronounced that sentence, had sat two-and-twenty years ago, and he conceived those of their Lordships, and the public in general, who were at all acquainted with the peculiarly hard and unfair circumstances that had attended his being tried at all, had long been accustomed to see the whole of that business in its true point of view. *What had been the temper of those times? Faction and clamour predominated: they both ran against him, and he had been made the*

victim of the most unexampled persecution that ever a British officer had been pursued with. In the first place, he had been condemned unheard, punished before trial. Stripped of all his military honours and emoluments upon mere rumour, upon the malicious suggestions of his enemies, without their having been called upon to exhibit the smallest proof of their loose assertion and acrimonious invective: he stood pointed out to the world as a man easy to be run down by clamour, and to fall a sacrifice to faction. Thus cruelly circumstanced, thus made to suffer in a manner equally unparalleled and unjust; what had been his conduct? Had he fled, like a guilty man, and hid himself from the world? Many of their Lordships well knew that he had acted in a manner directly opposite. He had challenged his accusers to come forward, he had provoked enquiry, he had insisted upon a trial. Let their Lordships, in general, recollect that the court-martial which sat upon him, sat under very particular circumstances, and that amidst all the faction and clamour that prevailed against him, and which at the time had been most industriously excited and encouraged, he had stood firm in his resolutions; and determining to clear his character at any hazard, he had, in spite of all the arts that were used to persuade him to the contrary, insisted on his conduct being enquired into, and

determined to abide the consequences. What could their Lordships imagine induced him to persevere in this step with so much firmness, but a consciousness of his innocence? It was that, and that alone, which bore him up under the cruel difficulties he had to encounter, and that made him submit patiently to the consequence. During the progress of his endeavouring to obtain a trial, he well knew that had the sentence been more severe, had it been capital, it would have been executed. So much he was given to understand by those who took pains to persuade him not to persist in demanding a trial: but that did not deter him from his purpose, and he unremittingly persevered with that object before him. It did not become him to say a word of the court-martial, or of its proceedings; he had submitted to his sentence, and having so done, he thought he had fully acquitted himself to his country at the time. At present, neither the charge, nor the defence, nor the evidence, nor any part of that proceeding was before their Lordships; and yet they were called upon to put the sentence in force a second time against him. Not that he meant to express any, the least objection, to the whole of the proceedings being examined; happy should he have been indeed, if the whole of the case had been submitted to their Lordships' investigation.

He would gladly now submit his honour and his life to their judgement : nay, to the noble Marquis's own decision, as a man of honour. He was conscious in his own mind, that the matter would not, in that case, have been taken up in the manner it now was, though he had no doubt the noble Marquis meant nothing but what was consistent with his own honour, and his sense of what was due to the honour of the House. He certainly had acted in a way that was manly and fair, to take it up while he was present, and not behind his back. With regard to the court-martial and the sentence, let their Lordships recollect what had happened since that time, with respect to him. No longer after both happened, than four years, namely in the year 1765, he had been called to the Privy Council, and brought into office. Previous to his accepting the offers that were then made to him, of taking a part in the administration of that day, it had been agreed that he should be first called to the Council-board, which he had ever considered as a virtual repeal of the sentence of the court-martial. He had continued a member of the Privy Council for ten years (from 1765 to 1775) without hearing a word of the court-martial, or its being thought by any means a matter of disqualification. Several years ago his Majesty had honour-

ed him so far; as to appoint him to the high office of Secretary of State, an office which he had filled ever since, without hearing a word of the sentence. Let their Lordships then consider of the hardship of that sentence being urged against him, as a disqualification for a seat in that House, which had been deemed no disqualification whatever of his being a Privy Counsellor and a Secretary of State; two situations, surely of more dignity and of more importance, considering the form of the British constitution, than even a peerage, high and dignified as the honour undoubtedly was: nor did the matter of hardship merely consist in bringing the sentence forward now, but the making it a ground of censure. Would their Lordships sanction, confirm, and aggravate a sentence, pronounced by a court-military, without having the whole of the case before them? That would be to make the military law, sufficiently severe as it confessedly was at present, ten times more severe, by annexing to its judgment the censure of a civil court of judicature. Another part of the motion he could not but object to, and must take the liberty of saying, that it did not appear to him to be in the smallest degree consonant with justice. What he meant was, the annexing to the sentence of the court-martial, that comment which the executive power had taken

upon itself to superadd. To the sentence of the court-martial he was bound by the laws military to submit: and to that sentence he had submitted: but would any man of honour say that he was answerable for the comment of the executive government? Undoubtedly he was not. The court-martial alone was competent to pronounce upon what they thought his conduct had been: he was tried by them, *not by the executive government.*

From the time he was called to the Privy Council to the present moment, and especially since he had accepted of that high office, he had endeavoured to serve his King and country to the best of his judgment. He would not pretend to cope with any man in respect to abilities: there were many he was persuaded more able than himself; but there were points in which he would not yield to all who had before been in the service of the crown. He defied any man to prove that the public ever had a servant who had shewed more unremitting assiduity, more close attention to the duties of his situation, or more zeal for promoting the interests of the country than he had done, from the moment of his accepting the high office he had lately filled till his resignation of it.

With regard to the court-martial, it was impossible for him to procure a revision of the pro-

ceeding: it happened two-and-twenty years since, and every member who sat upon it, excepting two very respectable characters, Lord Robert Manners and Lord Bertie, had been dead and buried long ago: any attempt to investigate the motives which actuated the several members of the court was now impracticable; but after what he had said, he flattered himself their Lordships, in general, would agree with him, that he was a person competent to receive the honours his Majesty had been graciously pleased to bestow upon him; that he was not responsible to the executive government, which were, in the motion, annexed to the court-martial, and that it was neither expedient, necessary, nor becoming for that House to fly in the face of the indisputable prerogative of the crown, merely because the crown thought proper to bestow a reward on an old servant.

The Duke of Grafton, Lord Southampton [formerly Colonel Fitzroy], the Earl of Abingdon, the Earl of Derby, and the Duke of Richmond, supported the motion, which was lost by a large majority.

Thus terminated this unprecedented affair: and, it is worthy of remark, that nearly the whole of those who were in the minority, had been personally attacked by Junius. Some of these, not satisfied with the division of the House on

the question, drew up a dissentient, as a further memorial of their opinions. Viscount Sackville was with difficulty restrained from sending the Marquis of Carmarthen a challenge, considering that throughout the business, he had pursued him in an unwarrantable, dishonourable manner. The first motion he would have overlooked, but this double attack betrayed a something more than the purport of the motion stated. Mr. Cumberland thus describes his feelings on this galling occasion. "The well known circumstances that occurred upon the event of his elevation to the peerage, made a deep and painful impression on his feeling mind; and if his seeming patience under the infliction of it, should appear to merit, in a moral sense, the name of virtue, that he had no title to be credited for, inasmuch as it was entirely owing to the influence of some who overruled his propensities, and made themselves responsible for his honour, that he did not betake himself to the same abrupt unwarrantable mode of dismissing this insult, as he had resorted to in a former instance. No man can speak from a more intimate knowledge of his feelings upon this occasion than I can; and if I was not on the side of those, who no doubt spoke well and wisely when they spoke for peace, it is one amongst the many errors and offences which I have yet to repent of. There

was once a Sir Edward Sackville, whom the world has heard of, who probably would not have possessed himself with so much calmness and forbearance, as did a late noble head of his family, whilst the question I alluded to was in agitation, and he present in his place. It was by the medium of this noble personage, that Lord Viscount Sackville meditated to send that invitation he had prepared, when the interposition and well considered remonstrances of some of his nearest friends, in particular of Lord Amherst, put him by from his resolve, and dictated a conduct more conformable to prudence; but much less suited to his inclination.

“ The law that is sufficient for the redress of injuries does not always reach to the redress of insults ; thus it comes to pass, that many men in other respects wise, and just, and temperate, not having resolution to be right in their own consciences, have set aside both reason and religion, and in compliance with the evil practices of the world about them, performed their bloody sacrifices, and immolated human victims to the idol of false honour. Truth obliges me to confess, that the friend of whom I am speaking, though possessing one of the best and kindest hearts that ever beat within a human breast, was with difficulty diverted from resorting a second time to that desperate remedy, which mo-

dern empirics have prescribed for wounds of a peculiar sort, oftentimes imaginary and always to be cured by patience.”

From this time his Lordship appears to have lived in a retired manner, occasionally at Drayton in Northamptonshire, or at Bolebrook near Tunbridge Wells ; but principally at his beautiful mansion, Stoneland Park*, adjoining the parish of Withyham in Sussex. Here, away from the bustle of public life, the cavils of party, and the rancorous spirit of his enemies, he passed the remainder of his days in retirement. This is generally the last refuge which all extraordinary men fly to ; where the passions may be allayed, and the mind prepared for a happier state of existence.

Hath not old custom made this life more sweet
 Than that of painted pomp ? Are not these woods
 More free from peril than the envious court ?
 Here feel we but the penalty of Adam,
 The seasons' difference ; as, the icy fang,
 And churlish chiding of the winter's wind ;
 Which, when it bites and blows upon my body,
 E'en till I shrink with cold, I smile, and say,
 ' This is no flattery ; these are counsellors
 That feelingly persuade me what I am.
 Sweet are the uses of adversity,

* Now Buckhurst Park.

Which, like the toad, ugly and venomous,
Wears yet a precious jewel in his head :
And this our life, exempt from public haunt,
Finds tongues in trees, books in the running brooks,
Sermons in stones, and good in every thing.'

AS YOU LIKE IT.—Act ii.

To his Lordship's immortal honour be it spoken, that, in this retreat, sequestered from the world, he was a warm benefactor to the poor, and beloved by all who daily waited at the gates of his hospitable mansion. Mr. Cumberland has related many trifling incidents, which on first perusal induce us to believe that his Lordship's faculties were, in some measure, impaired by the perplexities of a long public life, combined with so many unprosperous circumstances ; but we are convinced, when we arrive at that period, only a few hours previous to his dissolution, that our suspicions are totally groundless ; for no man ever seemed to possess clearer conceptions, was more fully alive to his situation, or met death with greater firmness and Christian resignation.

As the domestic movements, and the expressions which fall from eminent men, particularly in the evening of life, are at all times interesting, I shall again quote Mr. Cumberland, being able to testify from other authorities who personally

knew his Lordship, that we have a statement which may be fully relied upon.

“ I now foresaw”, says Mr. Cumberland, “ the coming on of an event, that must inevitably deprive me of one of the greatest comforts, which still adhered to me in my decline of fortune. It was too evident that the constitution of Lord Sackville, long harassed by the painful visitation of that dreadful malady, the stone, was decidedly giving way. There was in him so generous a repugnance against troubling his friends with any complaints, that it was from external evidence only, never from confession, that his sufferings could be guessed at. Attacks that would have confined most people to their beds, never moved him from his habitual punctuality. It was curious, and probably in some men’s eyes would, from its extreme precision, have appeared ridiculously minute and formal ; yet in the movements of a domestic establishment so large as his, it had its uses and comforts, which his guests and family could not fail to partake of. As sure as the hand of the clock pointed to the half-hour after nine, did the good lord of the castle step into his breakfast room, accoutred at all points, according to his own invariable costume, with a complacent countenance that prefaced his good morning to each

person there assembled ; and now whilst I recal these scenes to my remembrance, I feel gratified by the reflection, that I never passed a night beneath his roof, but that his morning's salutation met me at my post. He allowed an hour and a half for breakfast, and regularly at eleven took his morning's circuit on horseback at a foot's-pace, for his infirmity would not allow of strong gestation. He had an old groom, who had grown grey in his service, who was his constant pilot on these excursions, and his general custom was to make the tour of his cottages, to reconnoitre the condition they were in, whether their roofs were in repair ; their windows whole, and the gardens well cropt, and neatly kept. All this it was their interest to be attentive to, for he bought the produce of their fruit trees ; and I have heard him say with great satisfaction, that he has paid thirty shillings in a season for strawberries only, to a poor cottager, who paid him one shilling annual rent for his tenement and garden : this was the constant rate at which he let them to his labourers, and he made them pay it to his steward at his yearly audit, that they might feel themselves in the class of regular tenants, and sit down at table to the good cheer provided for them on the audit-day. He never rode out without preparing himself with a store of six-pences in his waistcoat pocket for

the children of the poor, who opened gates and drew out sliding bars for him in his passage through the enclosures : these barriers were well watched ; and there was rarely any employment for a servant : but these sixpences were not indiscriminately bestowed, for as he kept a charity-school upon his own endowment, he knew to whom he gave them, and generally held a short parley with the gate-opener as he paid his toll for passing. Upon the very first report of illness or accident, relief was instantly sent, and they were put upon the sick list, regularly visited, and constantly supplied with the best medicines, administered upon the best advice. If the poor man lost his cow, or his pig, or his poultry, the loss was never made up in money, but in stock. It was his custom to buy the cast-off liveries of his own servants as constantly as the day of clothing came about, and these he distributed to the old and worn-out labourers, who turned out daily on the lawn in the Sackville livery, to pick up boughs and sweep up leaves, and, in short, do just as much work as served to keep them wholesome and alive.

“ To his religious duties, this good man was not only regularly but respectfully attentive. On the Sunday morning he appeared in gala, as if he were dressed for a drawing-room ; he marched out his whole family in grand cavalcade

to his parish church, leaving only a centinel to watch the fires at home, and mount guard upon the spits. His deportment in the House of Prayer was exemplary, and more in character of times past than of time present. He had a way of standing up in sermon time, for the purpose of reviewing the congregation and awing the idlers into decorum, that never failed to remind me of Sir Roger de Coverley at church. Sometimes, when he has been struck with passages in the discourse, which he wished to point out to the audience as rules for moral practice worthy to be noticed, he would mark his approbation of them, with such cheering nods and signals of assent to the preacher, as were often more than my muscles could withstand.

“He had nursed up with no small care and cost, in each of his parish churches, a corps of rustic psalm-singers, to whose performances he paid the greatest attention, rising up, and with his eyes directed to the singing gallery, marking time, which was not always rigidly adhered to; and once, when his ear, which was very correct, had been tortured by a tone most glaringly discordant, he set his mark upon the culprit by calling out to him by name, and loudly saying, ‘Out of tune, Tom Baker!’ Now this faulty musician, Tom Baker, happened to be his Lordship’s butcher; but then in order to set names and trades

upon a par, Tom Butcher was his Lordship's baker; which, I observed to him, was much such a reconciliation of cross partners, as my illustrious friend George Faulkner hit upon when in his Dublin Journal he printed, 'Erratum in our last—For his Grace the Duchess of Dorset, *read*, Her Grace the Duke of Dorset.' I relate these little anecdotes of a man, whose character had nothing little in it, that I may shew him to my readers in his private scenes, and be as far as I am able the intimate and true transcriber of his heart.

“ It was in the year 1785, whilst I was at Stoneland, that those symptoms first appeared, which gradually disclosed such evidences of debility, as could not be concealed, and shewed to demonstration that the hand of death was even then upon him. He had prepared himself with an opinion deliberately formed upon the matter of the Irish propositions, and when that great question was appointed to come on for discussion in the House of Lords, he thought himself bound in honour and duty to attend in his place. He then for the first time confessed himself to be unfit for the attempt, and plainly declared he believed it would be his death. He paused for a few moments, as if in hesitation how to decide, and the air of his countenance was impressed with melancholy; we were standing

under the great spreading tree that shelters the back entrance to the house; the day was hot; he had dismounted heavily from his horse; we were alone, and it was plain that exercise, though gentle, had increased his languor; he was oppressed both in body and spirit; he did not attempt to disguise it, for he could no longer counterfeit; he sat down upon the bench at the tree-foot, and composing his countenance, as if he wished to have forced a smile upon it, had his suffering given him leave, 'I know,' said he, 'as well as you can tell me, what you think of me just now, and that you are convinced if I go to town, upon this Irish business, I go to my death; but I also know you are at heart not against my undertaking it, for I have one convincing proof ever present to me, how much more you consult my honour than my safety; and after all, what do I sacrifice, if, with the sentence of inevitable death in my hand, I only lop off a few restless hours, and in the execution of my duty meet the stroke? In one word, I tell you I shall go, we will not have another syllable upon the subject; don't advise it, lest you should repent of it when it has killed me; and do not oppose it, because it would not be your true opinion, and if it were, I would not follow it.'

“ It was on that same day after dinner, as I

well remember, the evening being most serene and lovely, we seated ourselves in the chairs that were placed out on the garden grass-plot, which looks towards Crowbery and the forest. Our conversation led us to the affair of Minden; *my friend most evidently courted the discussion*; I told him I had diligently attended the whole process of the trial, and that I had detailed it to Mr. Doddington; I had consequently a pretty correct remembrance of the leading circumstances as they came out upon the evidence. But I observed to him that it was not upon the questions and proceedings agitated at that court, that I could perfect my opinion of the case; *there must be probably a chain of leading causes*, which, though they could not make a part of his defence in public court, might, if developed, throw such lights on the respective conduct of the parties, as would have led to conclusions different to those which stood upon the record. To this he answered that my remark was just; *there were certain circumstances antecedent to the action*, that should be taken into consideration, and there were certain forbearances posterior to the trial, that should be accounted for. The time was come, when he could have no temptation to disguise and violate the truth, and a much more awful trial was now close at hand, when he must suffer for it if he did. He would

talk plainly, temperately, and briefly to me, as his manner was, provided I would promise him to deal sincerely, and not spare to press him on such points as required explanation. This being premised, he entered upon a detail, which unless I could give as taken down from his lips, without the variation of a word, so sacred do I hold the reputation of the dead intrusted to me, and the feelings of the living whom any error of mind might wound, that I shall forbear to speak of it except in general terms.

“ He appeared to me throughout the whole discourse, like a man who had perfectly dismissed his passions; his colour never changed, his features never indicated embarrassment, his voice was never elevated, and being relieved at times, with my questions and remarks, he appeared to speak without pain, and in the event his mind seemed lightened with the discharge.

“ When I compare what he said to me in his last moments, not two hours before he expired, with what he stated at this conference, if I did not from my heart, and upon the most solemn conviction of my reason and understanding, solemnly acquit that injured man, now gone to his account, of the opprobrious and false imputations deposed against him at his trial, I must

be either brutally ignorant, or wilfully obstinate against the truth.

“ At the battle of Fontenoy, at the head of his brave regiment, in the very front of danger, and the heat of action, he received a bullet in his breast, and being taken off the field by his grenadiers, was carried into a tent belonging to the equipage of the French King, and there laid upon a table whilst the surgeon dressed his wound ; so far had that glorious column penetrated in their advance towards victory, unfortunately snatched from them. Let us contemplate the same man, commanding the British cavalry in the battle of Minden, no longer in the front of danger and the heat of action, no longer in the pursuit of victory, for that was gained ; and can we think, with his unjust defamer*, that such a man would tremble at a flying foe ? It is a supposition against nature, a charge that cannot stand, an imputation that confutes itself.”

It is much to be regretted that Cumberland has not given us a sufficient detail of what passed at this interesting conference to have removed all doubts from the minds of his enemies, touching his innocence, more especially as the sentence remains to this day on record ; for al-

* Lord Southampton, the Duke of Grafton's brother.

though unprejudiced and unbiassed minds have universally acknowledged that Lord Sackville was an injured man, and that his honour was sacrificed to calumny and malice, yet we have positive evidence that many noble families remain strongly impressed with the justice of his sentence; a few of the leading circumstances which were touched upon during this conference might have tended to dismiss all prejudices had they been properly explained. Mr. Cumberland has given us his own private opinion, which, though clear and satisfactory to most, is not sufficient to influence the whole of mankind. Had he developed the causes which his Lordship named to him only two hours previous to his dissolution, the mystery that has so long been attached to this eventful period in history, would have been satisfactorily cleared up, and his Lordship's name would consequently have been classed among the heroes of renown. Cumberland was evidently entrusted with some secrets, which he was bound in honour not to disclose, one instance in particular. "What that instance was," he observes, "he needed not to have explained to me, nor am I careful to explain to any." His remarks are frequently couched in mysterious language: in another place, when speaking of Junius—"I never heard," says he, "that my friend Lord George

Germain was among the suspected authors, *till, by way of jest, he told me so not many days before his death*; I did not want him to disavow it, for there could be no occasion to disprove an absolute impossibility."

The opinion Cumberland entertained of Junius was in direct contradiction to the apparent character of Lord Sackville, which he held in such high esteem, that *he did not want him to disavow it*. One would have thought there was the greater occasion, that he might have been convinced the suspicion was groundless. I maintain, that it is impossible for any one to read this extract, without being forcibly struck with the circumstance of a dying man introducing the subject voluntarily, when he had never before hinted it to him during a long and intimate acquaintance.

Cumberland asserts it was said in a joke; but every one who has been brought on a bed of sickness, or attended a friend or relation on such an occasion, must subscribe with myself in opinion, that this is not a time for joking. It appears, therefore, that Cumberland was unwilling to go into particulars with his noble friend, from the cause previously stated. Resolutions, however strongly made when health and strength are bestowed upon us, seldom or ever pass the confines of the grave. The soul,

preparing to unfetter itself from every earthly tie, strives to leave its tenement pure and unshackled, that it may appear in the presence of its Maker robed in white: so that all sublunary and temporal affairs, which at one time seemed to possess interest and importance, cease to operate as mysteries. Lord Sackville confessed to his friend, that “the time was come, when he could have no temptation to disguise and violate the truth, a much more awful trial was now close at hand, when he must suffer for it, if he did.”

In this frame of mind, alive to his situation, and feeling that the lamp of life, which for some time had been burning dim, was now nearly extinguished, he enquired of his friend, “if Lord Mansfield was then at the Wells”. It was evident that the circumstance just alluded to dwelt heavily on his mind, by his anxiety to see that nobleman, with whom he was at the time on no terms of intimacy whatever. The interview is too interesting and affecting to pass over in silence. Cumberland having immediately proceeded to the Wells, in compliance with his Lordship’s request, was fortunate enough to succeed in returning with Lord Mansfield. “I was present”, he adds, “at their interview; Lord Sackville, just dismounted from his horse, came into the room where he [Lord Mansfield] had waited a very few

minutes: he staggered as he advanced to reach his hand to his respectable visitor; he drew his breath with palpitating quickness, and, if I remember rightly, never rode again. There was a death-like character in his countenance, that visibly affected and disturbed Lord Mansfield, in a manner that I did not quite expect, for it* had more of horror in it than a firm man ought to have shewn, and less, perhaps, of other feelings, than a friend, invited to a meeting of that nature, must have discovered, had he not been frightened from his propriety.

“As soon as Lord Sackville had recovered his breath, his visitor remaining silent, he began by apologising for the trouble he had given him, and for the unpleasant spectacle he was conscious of exhibiting to him, in the condition he was now reduced to, ‘but my good Lord,’ he said, ‘though I ought not to have imposed upon you the painful ceremony of paying a last visit to a dying man, yet so great was my anxiety to return you my unfeigned thanks for all your goodness to me, all the kind protection you have shewn me through the course of my unprosperous life, that I could not know you were so near me, and not wish to assure you of the invariable respect I have entertained for your character, *and now,*

* Lord Mansfield’s countenance.

*in the most serious manner, to solicit your forgiveness, if ever, in the fluctuations of politics, or the heats of party, I have appeared in your eyes, at any moment of my life, unjust to your great merits, or forgetful of your many favours.**

“When I record this speech, I give it to the reader as correct: I do not trust to memory at this distance: I transcribe it: I scorn the paltry trick of writing speeches for any man whose name is in these memoirs, or for myself, in whose name these memorials shall go forth respectable at least for their veracity; for I certainly cannot wish to present myself to the world in two such opposite and incoherent characters, as the writer of my own history and the hero of a fiction. Lord Mansfield made a reply perfectly becoming and highly satisfactory: he was far on in years, and not in sanguine health, or in a strong state of nerves: there was no immediate reason to continue the discourse; Lord Sackville did not press for it: his visitor departed, and I staid with him. He made no other observation upon what had passed, than that it was extremely obliging in Lord Mansfield, and then turned to other subjects.”

This affecting interview requires but little

* There is no instance on record of Lord Sackville having received any favours from Lord Mansfield, which makes the interview the more extraordinary.

comment; it speaks volumes. Would any nobleman, I ask, unconscious of having wounded the feelings of another, take the trouble to send seven miles to request an interview, and to ask forgiveness for political errors, which he might have committed? No—but the wounds inflicted by Junius were of too deep and penetrating a nature ever to be healed, unless at a moment like the present. That heart, indeed, must have been callous to all feeling, which could leave the world without atonement, if it had it in its power; and it does honour to the memory of Lord Viscount Sackville, that he had sufficient fortitude left for the present occasion. He undoubtedly felt relieved in the performance of a duty, which the erring spirits of men owe one to another. Yet Lord Mansfield does not appear to have betrayed those symptoms of forgiveness, which were suited to so solemn an interview: he left the house somewhat abruptly; not a word transpired, how concerned he was at finding the dying nobleman in so weak a state; nor a hint escaped his lips at the afflicting situation of his family, who were about to be bereft of his society for ever. “It was the only opportunity”, says Cumberland, “I had of knowing something of the movements of Lord Mansfield’s heart; I caught a glimpse, as it were, through a crevice, but it soon shut up, and the

exterior remained as before, *totus teres alque rotundus.*”

This solemn interview with Lord Mansfield took place soon after Lord Sackville's return from Parliament, where he spoke for the last time. He gave his sentiments upon the great Irish question, in so animated, so able a speech, that we are disposed to consider it as the language of a man entering his fiftieth year, rather than his sixty-ninth. He meditated a union with that distracted country, as the only resource for quieting the internal dissensions of the people. This was afterwards accomplished by Mr. Pitt and Lord Castlereagh. The exertion was too much for him; he returned home, as he had predicted, a dying man, which made him anxious that his interview with Lord Mansfield should not be delayed.

What a lesson have we here of the instability of all human greatness! Seldom does it fall to the lot of any individual to witness so affecting a scene, which Cumberland confesses a lapse of twenty years had not effaced from his memory. The last moments of Altamont, Rousseau, and Addison possess but little interest, when brought into comparison with the present. Here we witness two of the most powerful men of the age, after long, perplexed, and harassing public lives, meeting for the last time in this sublunary state

of existence, and verifying the truth of an old philosopher's assertion, "That life indeed is a farce, when reviewed through the medium of reason."

The labour of poring over volumes connected with this Enquiry, is amply repaid by the interest attached to the nobleman in question, which increases, rather than diminishes, as we draw nearer to the conclusion. After this interview he gradually became weaker and weaker.

"He allowed me", continues Mr. Cumberland, "to call in Sir Francis Millman, then practising at Tonbridge-Wells; all medical assistance was in vain: the saponaceous medicines that had given him intervals of ease, and probably many years of existence, had now lost their efficacy, or, by their efficacy, worn their conductors out. In him the vital principle was strong, and nature, which resisted dissolution, maintained at every outpost that defended life, a lingering agonizing struggle. Through every stage of varied misery, 'extremes by change more fierce', his fortitude remained unshaken, his senses perfect, and his mind never died till the last pulse was spent, and his heart stopped for ever.

"In this period, intelligence arrived of the propositions being withdrawn in the Irish House of Commons; he had letters on the subject from several correspondents, and one from Lord Syd-

ney, none of which we thought fit then to give him. I told him in as few words, and as clearly as I could, how the business passed, but requested he would simply hear it, and not argue upon it. ‘I am not sorry’, he said, ‘that it has so happened; something might now be set on foot for the benefit of both countries. I wish I could live long enough to give my opinions in my place; I have formed my thoughts upon it; but it is too late for me to do any good; I hope it will fall into abler hands, and you forbid me to argue. I see you are angry with me for talking, and indeed it gives me pain. I have nothing to do in this life, but to obey and be silent.’

“From that moment he never spoke a word upon the subject.

“As I knew he had been sometime meditating upon his preparations to receive the sacrament, and death seemed near at hand, I reminded him of it; he declared himself ready; *in one instance only, he confessed it cost him a hard struggle. What that instance was, he needed not to explain to me, nor am I careful to explain to any.* I trust, according to the infirmity of man’s nature, he is rather to be honoured for having finally extinguished his resentment, than condemned for having fostered it too long. A Christian saint would have done it sooner; how many men would not have done it ever!

“ The Reverend Mr. Sackville Bayle, his worthy parish priest *, and ever faithful friend, administered the solemn office of the sacrament to him, reading at his request the prayers for a communicant at the point of death. He had ordered all his bed curtains to be opened and the sashes thrown up, that he might have air and space to assist him in his efforts ; what they were, with what devotion he joined in those solemn prayers, that warn the parting spirit to dismiss all hopes that centre in this world, that reverend friend can witness. I also was a witness and a partaker : none else was present at that holy ceremony.

“ A short time before he expired, I came by his desire to his bed-side, when taking my hand, and pressing it between his, he addressed me, for the last time, in the following words : ‘ You see me now in those moments, when no disguise will serve, and when the spirit of a man must be proved. I have a mind perfectly resigned, and at peace within itself. I have done with this world, and what I have done in it, I have done for the best : I hope and trust I am prepared for the next. Tell not me of all that passes in health and pride of heart ; these are the moments, in which a man must be searched, and remember that I die, as you see me, with a tranquil conscience and content.’ ”

* A clergyman of the Established Church.

That penetrating eye, which once saw so keenly the innermost recesses of the human heart, was now closed for ever. His Lordship expired on the 26th August 1785. Cumberland followed his remains to the family vault at Withyham, contiguous to the Park, wherein they were deposited among other illustrious branches of the Dorset family.

Quiet, rural, peaceful is the spot. From Tunbridge Wells the ride thither is delightful, through a luxuriant, picturesque country, pleasingly diversified by hills, dales, and sloping woodlands. A solemnity reigns around as you approach the sacred sanctuary. All is a pensive solitude. It was a fine autumnal evening when I entered the village, and the setting sun tinged with his parting rays the clouds, the woods, and the meadows. The fine old oaks had not yet begun to shed their foliage, but were clothed in all that rich variety of light and shade peculiar to the season. The sons and daughters of health and content were returning home from their daily toil, with happiness depicted in every countenance. The blacksmith's hammer alone was heard.

The church at Withyham is simple, but standing on rising ground is a conspicuous object. The village, consisting only of a few cottages, is interesting, because it was the scene of his Lordship's benevolence, and because se-

veral of the inhabitants are yet alive, who bear ample testimony to his goodness. Buckhurst Park, where he spent the evening of his life, and where he paid the debt of nature, is, upon the whole, the finest I ever entered. It is still kept up in most excellent order, the poor villagers being constantly employed by Lord Whitworth in repairing the paths and roads. The mansion appears to have been formerly an abbey, but has of late undergone considerable alterations. It is delightfully situate, commanding an extensive view over the adjacent country, Crowborough, Hartfield, and the Forest. The Reverend Mr. Sackville Bayle, who administered the sacrament to his Lordship in his last moments, is still living. Through the politeness of that gentleman I obtained the keys of the church, with liberty to descend the family vault. In the former, there are but few monuments, nor would a stranger suppose that all which now remains of the generous, the accomplished, and the brave, is fast mouldering beneath him: but on entering the chamber of death, the number and magnificence of some of the coffins forcibly arrest the attention. You are surrounded on either side by the ashes of those who once figured on the stage of life, and who were justly ranked among the honourable of the earth. Some of the coffins are crumbling to decay, one of which is so far gone

that you can discern the skeleton : another contains only an embalmed heart. I explored the catacombs of Paris with far less interest than this vault. The ideas associated with that charnel are too horrible, from their connection with the terrors of the Revolution : here, the mind pauses, and reverts back to scenes both domestic and political, with which we are all conversant, and wherein the lifeless tenants once formed so prominent a feature in our own history.

The inscriptions were difficult to read, the ravages of time having effaced some and rendered others nearly illegible. I traced that of Lionel Duke of Dorset, who was five times Lord Lieutenant of Ireland in the reign of George the Second : and at his feet discovered that of his son, denominated by Mr. Pitt, the Agamemnon of the day, and by Lord North, the mighty Boar of the Forest. A brass plate with the following simple inscription, is the only distinguishing mark—

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE
GEORGE VISCOUNT SACKVILLE,

AND

BARON BOLEBROOK,

DIED

AUGUST 26TH, 1785, AGED 69 YEARS.


There is nothing further to perpetuate his

memory or to record the worth of this distinguished character. No encomium, no comment: there he lies in the sepulchre of his forefathers; a lesson to survivors of the instability of all human greatness: neither is there any stone, or tablet, or monument in the church. I quitted this plain unadorned structure with the impression, that as his labours instruct and enlighten mankind, none now is wanting, for Junius has left a name behind him, that will be transmitted to posterity, when kings and ministers are forgotten: a name that will be immortalized,

“ When granite moulders, and when records fail.”

THE END.







HE UNIVERSI

E UNIVERSIT

GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—BERKELEY

RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED

This book is due on the last date stamped below, or on the date to which renewed.

Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

30 Nov '54 MB

NOV 16 1967

23 May '56 BE

MAY 1 1950

APR 8 1970

RECEIVED

APR 25 '70 - 3 PM

LOAN

21-100m-1, '54 (1887s16) 476



